

Jonathan A. Silk

It is never easy to understand any Indian Buddhist text. Every volume—sometimes it seems like every line on every page—is filled with terms and ideas foreign to us, obscure, part of a jigsaw puzzle-like world many of whose pieces we have not yet discovered or correctly identified. Yet, we can sometimes uncover continuities in ideas or usages that may, especially when put into a broader context of Buddhist thought, yield significant insights into the tradition as a whole, allowing us to gradually discern the outlines and underlying structures of the system. Professor Gadjin M. Nagao, the great scholar to whom this volume is dedicated, has shown us by his example how careful consideration of individual words may deepen our understanding of Buddhist thought, enhance our ability to read a variety of Buddhist texts with greater precision, and gradually work toward a more comprehensive appreciation of old Indian Buddhist world-views. In the following I would like to offer to Prof. Nagao what I believe to be, although small, a potentially important piece of this large puzzle.

The term *yogācāra bhikṣu* appears several times in the relatively early Mahāyāna sūtra *Kāśyapa-parivarta*, of which Prof. Nagao and I are preparing a new translation, and again more regularly in the probably somewhat later text upon which I focussed my doctoral thesis, the *Ratnarāśisūtra*.<sup>1</sup> Although both of these sūtras certainly

---

\* This is a substantially revised version of part of chapter 4 of my doctoral dissertation, Silk 1994: 97–142.

I would like to thank Nobuyoshi Yamabe for his generous assistance, criticism, and discussion over the years on the specific and general problems dealt with here. I was also fortunate enough to receive a detailed and lengthy critique of an earlier draft from Prof. Lambert Schmithausen, which has dramatically improved the paper. In addition, for their many corrections and for much information I am indebted to Professors Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Harunaga Isaacson, Seishi Karashima, Shōryū Katsura, Gadjin Nagao, and Gregory Schopen. I thank also Prof. Madhav Deshpande for his remarks on Sanskrit grammar, and Kaoru Onishi and Klaus Wille for their kindness in sending me materials. None of the above are, of course, responsible for any of the shortcomings of the paper.

1. See Silk 1994. I am preparing a new edition of the Indic text of the *Kāśyapa-parivarta*, a critical edition of the Tibetan and Chinese translations and, together with Prof. Nagao, an English translation. We hope to publish the complete results of our study before too long.

contain a large amount of obviously problematic vocabulary, my attention was nevertheless drawn to the perhaps not so clearly troublesome term *yogācāra bhikṣu*. I gradually realized that although I thought I could translate the term adequately, I did not actually clearly understand it. The present paper, then, represents one attempt to investigate this term, primarily as it is used in so-called Mainstream Buddhism and early Mahāyāna literature, but with some attention also given to its use in the later and more systematic śāstric literature.<sup>2</sup>

When the word *yogācāra* is defined by dictionaries of Classical Sanskrit, its primary sense is given as "the practice or observance of Yoga."<sup>3</sup> It is thus understood as a genitive *tatpuruṣa*. The word appears to be rare in Classical Sanskrit, although it does occur in several technical works.<sup>4</sup> The form *yogācāra* apparently does not occur in either of the two Epics, the *Mahābhārata* or *Rāmāyaṇa*, but a related term, *yogācārya*, appears several times in the former.<sup>5</sup>

2. I do not know whether, and if so how, the term is used in Buddhist logical or tantric literature, fields in which I have no competence.

3. Apte 1957, s.v., without citation. Monier-Williams 1899 s.v. also cites the term as equivalent to *yogin*, again without reference. Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875 s.v. define it as "die Observanz des Joga," as well as "Titel einer Schrift über den Joga," citing for the second sense Mallinātha's commentary on *Kumārasambhava* 3.47, but the latter is apparently an error. The text I have been able to check has instead *Yogasāra* (Thakur 1987).

4. The last verse of Praśastapāda's *Padārthadharmaśāstram* (Jetly and Parikh 1991: 698) reads: *yogācāravibhūtyā yas toṣayitvā mabeśvaram | cakre vaiśeṣikam śāstram tasmai kaṇabhujē namaḥ |* "Homage to Kaṇabhuj who, having pleased Maheśvara (i.e., Śiva) by the richness of his practice of yoga, created the Vaiśeṣika śāstra (i.e., *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra*-s)." In Vācaspatimiśra's *Tātparyatīkā*, glossing Pakṣilasvāmin's *Nyāyabhāṣya* ad *Nyāya-sūtra* 4.2.46 (Taranatha Nyaya-Tarkatirtha and Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha 1936–1944), he explains *yogācāra* as: *ekākitā āhāra-viśeṣaḥ ekatrānavasthānam ityādi yatidharmoktam*. "Yogācāra is the practice of renunciates comprising solitude, [eating only] special foods, not staying in one place, and so on."

In both examples, the term is clearly a *tatpuruṣa*. I owe these references entirely to the kindness of Dr. Harunaga Isaacson.

5. Thanks to the invaluable computer data of the complete critical editions of the two Epics, input by Prof. Muneo Tokunaga and his students, I was able to easily check the entire corpus. I have found the following occurrences: *Mahābhārata* 1.60.42 (with regard to Bhṛṣgu) reads: *yogācāryo mahābuddhir daityānām abhavad gurur | surānām cāpi meghāvi brahmācārī yatavratāḥ |* Nilakaṇṭha comments: *yogācārya iti cāpi vyastau | surānām api ca gurur iti sambandhaḥ | devānām gurur eva yogācāryo yogabalena kāyadvayanī kṛtvā devānām apy ācāryo bhavad ity arthaḥ |* ...; 12.59.91: *adhyāyānām sahasreṇa kāvyāḥ samkṣepam abravīt | tac chāstram amitaprajño yogācāryo mahātapāḥ |*; 16.5.23: *tato*

In Buddhist texts in Sanskrit we find nearly exclusively the form *yogācāra*, with the feminine form *yogācārā*.<sup>6</sup> Sometimes the word is explicitly coordinated with *bhikṣu* (or in the feminine with *bhikṣunī*), but often it is not. I have never encountered the form \**yogācārin*, which should perhaps be considered a ghost word,<sup>7</sup> and have so far found the term *yogācārya* only a very few times in Buddhist texts.<sup>8</sup> The term *yogācāra* often appears coordinated with *yogin*, and indeed in some cases the terms appear to be used as synonyms.<sup>9</sup> In late canonical and post-canonical Pāli we find what seems to be an

*rājan bhagavān ugratejā nārāyaṇaḥ prabhavaś cāvyaś ca | yogācāryo rodasī vyāpya lakṣmīā sthānam prāpa svam mahātmāprameyam |* See also the prose passage at 12.185.1.2.

The term seems not to occur in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Note however that my search takes into account only the computer data of the critically established texts, and does not consider variants (which are often considerable).

The term *yogācārya* also appears in other similar texts, for example in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 9.12.3. According to Monier-Williams 1899 s.v., *yogācārya* is sometimes wrongly written for *yogācāra* but, again, he gives no reference (but the *Mahābhārata* passages obviously intend *yogācārya*).

The term *yogācārya* is relatively easy to understand, being a *tatpuruṣa* constructed from *yoga* and *ācārya*, apparently in a genitive relation, and it seems to mean just what we would expect: "master of yoga." The exact meaning of the term *yoga* is of course not thereby clarified, but with the proviso that *yoga* itself may remain not fully determined, the compound is basically clear.

6. For the feminine, see below n. 64.

7. The form *yogācārī bhikṣuḥ* is printed several times in Bendall's edition of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall 1897–1902: 55.13–18). However, the manuscript is perfectly clear in all cases in reading *yogācāro bhikṣuḥ*; see below n. 55. Perhaps the most plausible explanation is that in reading the early sheets of the proofs, being as he confesses (Wogihara 1904: 97, n. 1) unfamiliar with the St.-Petersburg type, Bendall failed to notice the misprint. Although somewhat similar in modern *devanāgarī*, *ī* and *o* are written entirely differently in the script of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* manuscript (Cambridge Add. 1478). A new edition of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is now in preparation by Jens Braarvig and myself.

8. Once in Schlingloff 1964: 128R2, and once in the *Abhidharmadīpa* (Jaini 1977: 337.2): *yogācāryasya khalv abhi* [subsequent text lost]. I have not found any indication of equivalents of *yogācārya* in Tibetan translations of Indic works. Bhattacharya 1982: 388 suggested that the Buddha is called *yogācārya* in the *Śivapurāṇa* II.5.16.11. The verse reads (edition Shri Venkateshvara Press, Bombay, 1965): *namas te gūḍha-dehāya vedanīmākarāya ca | yogācāryāya jaināya bauddharūpāya māpate |* (I owe the Sanskrit to the kindness of Prof. Georg von Simson.) While Bhattacharya is probably right that *yogācārya* is meant to qualify the Buddha, strictly speaking it refers to Viṣṇu in his *avatāra* as the Buddha, and it is not impossible that it is Viṣṇu who is here being called the "yoga master," rather than, or at least as much as, the Buddha.

9. See below for citations of *yogācāra* and *yogin* used appositionally.

equivalent term, *yogāvacara*.<sup>10</sup> The standard Tibetan equivalent of the Sanskrit, *ṛnal 'byor spyod pa*, fully supports the form *yogācāra*.<sup>11</sup> When we come to Chinese sources, however, we do not encounter the same precision.

The least equivocal Chinese rendering of *yogācāra* is *yuqieshi* 瑜伽師. The Chinese exegete Kuiji 窺基, the chief disciple of Xuanzang, has attempted a grammatical analysis of this term in his *Cheng Weishi-lun shuji* 成唯識論述記. He writes:<sup>12</sup> “A master of *yoga*’ is a *tatpuruṣa*.

10. On the Pāli evidence, see Silk 1997. The only canonical use of the term in Pāli is in the late *Paṭisambhidāmagga*.

11. Harunaga Isaacson has kindly drawn my attention to the word *yogacārya*, which occurs, for example, in *Hevajratāntra* I.vi.15 (Snellgrove 1959). Interestingly, it too is there rendered *ṛnal 'byor spyod pa*. I have not noticed this Sanskrit word in other Buddhist texts I have examined, but according to Isaacson it occurs in the *Mahābhārata* as well.

12. T. 1830 (XLIII) 272c6–14: 瑜伽之師、即依士[though often so read, likely a mistake for 主]釋。師有瑜伽名瑜伽師、即有財釋。La Vallée Poussin 1928–1929: I.46, note 1, in reference to this passage says that “Kuiji signals the variant *Yogācāra*.” Mukai 1978: 268 also seems to understand the reference as *yogācāra*. Miyamoto 1932: 780–81, however, thinks that Kuiji is thinking of *yogācārya*. Although not without problems, we should probably assume that 瑜伽之師 as a *tatpuruṣa* is intended to refer to a compound analyzed as *\*yogasya + ācārya*. The *bahuvrīhi* is especially hard to understand in its Chinese guise, but the reading 師有瑜伽 could support *\*yogācāra*, which as a *bahuvrīhi* certainly means 瑜伽師, but the 師 would be problematic. If we understand 師 to directly represent one of the members of the compound, *\*ācāra* would be ruled out. This would lead to the conclusion that here too *\*yogācārya* is intended, even though as a *bahuvrīhi* this is probably impossible. So far the *Cheng Weishi-lun shuji*. However, Nobuyoshi Yamabe has brought to my attention T. 1861 大乘法苑義林章 (XLV) 255b, in which in a rather confused argument the same Kuiji suggests that 成唯識論 = *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* is not only a *tatpuruṣa* but also a *bahuvrīhi*. The crucial sentence seems to be 255b15–16: 此論以唯識爲所成。名成唯識論。亦有財釋, “This treatise takes mere cognition (*\*vijñaptimātra*[tā]) as what is to be proved (*\*sādhya*), and thus it is called *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, which is a *bahuvrīhi*.” Actually, if I understand the passage at 255a23–25 correctly, Kuiji also seems to suggest that the term is a *karmadhāraya*! As Yamabe suggested to me, it is possible to speculate that since Kuiji knows that the treatise itself is not equivalent to *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, that is, he knows that the treatise *explains* the establishment of mere cognition but is not that establishment *itself*, he feels the term must somehow be a *bahuvrīhi*. All of this would strongly suggest that Kuiji was not quite at home with Sanskrit grammatical analysis.

We might just notice here the remarks of the Chinese Faxiang (Yogācāra) monk Huizhao 慧沼, in his sub-commentary on Kuiji’s commentary (T. 1832 [XLIII] 696a14–15): “There is an explanation that [*yogācāra* should be analyzed] as a *tatpuruṣa*: ‘a teacher of *yoga*.’ Or as a *bahuvrīhi*: ‘a teacher who possesses *yoga* (?)’ This is also a *tatpuruṣa*, and not a *bahuvrīhi*.” 有說瑜伽之師、即依士釋。師有瑜伽師、即有財

‘A master who possesses *yoga*’ is called a *yuqieshi* 瑜伽師; this is a *bahuvrīhi*.” This led some scholars, such as Louis de La Vallée Poussin, to suggest that what Kuiji had in mind here was the term *\*yogācārya*, perhaps since it does not seem possible to translate *yogācāra* as a *tatpuruṣa* with *yuqieshi*.<sup>13</sup> However, Kuiji’s knowledge of Sanskrit grammar is suspect, and the interpretation of his Korean colleague Toryun 遁倫 (better Tullyun 道倫?)<sup>14</sup> may, in this regard at least, be more correct. In his own voluminous commentary on the *Yogācārabhūmi*, Toryun seems well aware that *shi* 師 represents *ācāra*.<sup>15</sup> Other Chinese renderings, which we will discuss below, while valuable from the point of view of the meaning of *yogācāra*, do not contribute to our grammatical understanding of the term.

In agreement with what the Chinese sources seem to indicate, it has been usual for modern scholars, too, to interpret the primary

釋。此亦依主、而非有財。(There appears to be something wrong with the expression 師有瑜伽師, from which the final 師 should perhaps be deleted, although the expression is quoted with the same reading in T. 2266 [LXVII] 175a8–9. Prof. Schmithausen suggests that 師有瑜伽師 may be due to an understanding something like “a person who has *yoga* as his *ācāra*,” but with 師 being used for both “person” and “*ācāra*.”)

13. Kuiji is commenting on *Cheng Weishi-lun* T. 1585 (XXXI) 4b29, 瑜伽師, which La Vallée Poussin 1928–1929: I.46 rendered as “*Yogācārya*.” The problem was already alluded to by Sylvain Lévi in 1911: \*16, n. 1.

14. See Mochizuki 1932–1936: 4924b.

15. See T. 1828 (XLII), the 瑜伽論記. At 312c10–11 we find: 梵言。阿遮羅。此云 師。How Miyamoto 1932: 780 gets *ācārya*, 1933 [1985]: 178 *ācār(y)a*, out of this mystifies me. (Without referring to Miyamoto, Ue 1958: 29 unequivocally rejects *ācārya* here.) Further, Miyamoto 1932: 783 is fairly insistent that 師 must reflect Sanskrit *ācārya*, although he is clearly aware (and even more so in 1933) that *yogācāra* may be a *bahuvrīhi*. All of this, however, should not necessarily suggest that Toryun understood Sanskrit well. In his T. 1828 (XLII) 313a3–6, following a lengthy section which is a recapitulation and gloss on T. 1580 (XXX) 884, is what appears to be a somewhat garbled version of Kuiji’s T. 1829 (XLIII) 2b4–8, in which the term *Yogācārabhūmi* is discussed as follows: 師有瑜伽即財釋。瑜伽之師。依主釋也。瑜伽師之地。亦依主釋。瑜伽即地。二體無別。地是所詮。能詮即論。瑜伽師地之論。亦依主釋。合爲瑜伽師地論有三釋。We may translate this: “[If we interpret the compound *yogācāra* in the sense that] the master possesses *yoga*, then it is a *bahuvrīhi*. [If we interpret it to mean] a master of *yoga*, then it is a *tatpuruṣa*. [Then, we can interpret the compound *yogācārabhūmi* in the sense of] the *bhūmi* of a *yogācāra*, which again is a *tatpuruṣa*. [But] *yoga* and *bhūmi* are entirely identical. [Therefore, the compound may also be an appositional *karmadhāraya*]. *Bhūmi* is what is explained, and what explains is a *sāstra*. [Therefore, the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*] means the *sāstra* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*; this also is a *tatpuruṣa*. Altogether, three types of compounds [*bahuvrīhi*, *tatpuruṣa*, *karmadhāraya*] are involved in interpreting the [compound] *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*.” I thank Nobuyoshi Yamabe for his help with this passage.

usage of *yogācāra* in Buddhist literature as a *bahuvrīhi*, literally “one who has yoga as his practice” or “one who carries out his practice through yoga,” and thus “a practitioner of yoga.”<sup>16</sup> A recent article by Hajime Nakamura, however, has suggested another interpretation. Nakamura raised the possibility that the compound should be understood according to Pāṇini III.2.1 (*karmany-aN*).<sup>17</sup> According to the explanation of Madhav Deshpande, this rule allows the derivation of a compound with *ācāra* as an agentive final member, namely *yogaṁ ācarati iti yogācārah*.<sup>18</sup> Without test forms such as *\*yogācāraka*, we cannot then be certain whether the term should actually be understood as a *bahuvrīhi*.<sup>19</sup> It is, however, as Prof. Deshpande further pointed out, so understood in the *Abhidhānarājendra* (s.v. *yogāyāra*), *yogena ācārah yasya*: *yoga + ā + car + ghañ*. While it is, then, worthwhile being cautious in this regard, it might not be too rash to suggest that in its ordinary Buddhist usage *yogācāra* is probably an exocentric compound. Moreover, this usage seems to be particularly Buddhist, in so far as I have been able to determine.

In addition to the guidance we get from etymological considerations and from examining actual context and usage, Chinese translations of Indian Buddhist terms often provide what amounts to another interpretation which can also guide us in our own attempts to understand the term. But this very fact conceals a danger: how can we know that a given Chinese term in fact represents a given Indic term? Below we will examine a number of texts which we possess in either Sanskrit and Chinese or Tibetan and Chinese, and occasionally in all three. In the case of the term *yogācāra*, the virtually complete standardization of the Tibetan rendering allows us to set the Tibetan and Chinese translations side by side. And what we discover through this process is disturbing.

16. Matsunami 1954: 158, for example, explicitly calls it a *bahuvrīhi*.

17. Nakamura 1993 actually refers to the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* (Abhyankar 1978: 293.3–94.12 = XIII.59–82, in the chapter *Pāṇinidarśana*), and only tangentially to Pāṇini and Patañjali. The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* translation of Cowell and Gough 1904: 207 seems to be based on a slightly different text. The relevant discussion in the *Mahābhāṣya* is found in Kielhorn 1965: 95.21–96.4. For the grammatical discussion which follows I am entirely indebted to the kind explanations of Prof. Madhav Deshpande.

18. The feminine of such a compound should (according to P. IV.1.15) be *\*yogācārī*. Kātyāyana, however, (*vārttika* 7) suggests an alternative, namely that rather than *-aN* the suffix be understood as *-Na*, this yielding a feminine in *-ā*.

19. And since of course we have no accented instance of the term.

As an example, while *zuochan biqiu* 坐禪比丘 seems very often to correspond to *yogācāra bhikṣu*, *zuochan* itself at least more often certainly does *not* render *yogācāra*. A famous expression is that naming Revata the first among meditators, those who engage in *dhyāna*, which of course is very often rendered *zuochan* 坐禪.<sup>20</sup> The same Chinese term may also render other Sanskrit terms.<sup>21</sup> In his translation of the *Abhidharmakośa* Paramārtha, who is known for his inconsistency, renders the Sanskrit text's *yogācāra* once with *guanxingshi* 觀行師, then the term *dhyāyin* with *guanxingren* 觀行人, and then again another *yogācāra* with the same *guanxingren* 觀行人.<sup>22</sup> Here Xuanzang's translation is entirely consistent, with *yogācāra* both times rendered with the transcription-cum-translation *yugieshi* 瑜伽師.<sup>23</sup> Would that things were only this simple! What is truly distressing is that even this term which we might have felt with some confidence to systematically represent *yogācāra* in Chinese, *yugieshi* 瑜伽師, does not always and necessarily do so. When we encounter this rendering in one version of the *Laṅkāvatāra*, for instance, it clearly does *not* render *yogācāra*.<sup>24</sup> So perhaps it is only lesser translators than Xuanzang who falter?

On the whole, Xuanzang is certainly among the more consistent of the Chinese translators, and in fact he is often consistent even to

20. See, for example, the *Śūraṅgamasamādhi* T. 642 (XV) 643c18–19, in which we have 坐禪第一如離婆多, which is in Tibetan (Derge 132, *mdo sde, da*, 305b4) *la la na ni nam gru bzhi du bsam gtan par gyur*.

In the *Samādhirājasūtra*, chapter 28 (Dutt 1939–59: II.163.1), *daśame kumāra ānuśamsā dhyānādhimuktasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya ...* appears in Chinese (T. 639 [XV] 584c24) as 菩薩摩訶薩與禪相應, and (T. 640 [XV] 621a11) as 坐禪菩薩.

21. Again in the *Śūraṅgamasamādhi* 643c19–20 we find: 入諸城邑聚落乞食 ... 說法 ... 坐禪. Here the Tibetan (Derge 132, *mdo sde, da*, 305b6) has ... *yang dag par 'jog par snang ste!*, which Lamotte 1975: 60 reconstructs into *pratisamlina* (although this equivalent seems to me problematic). In any case, the Tibetan suggests neither *yogācāra* nor *dhyāna* here.

22. See Nagao 1994: I. xii. The passages cited are found at Pradhan 1975: 197.5–8, ad IV.4ab = T. 1559 (XXIX) 227a7–14.

23. T. 1558 (XXIX) 69b1–12.

24. See the *Laṅkāvatāra*, T. 672 (XVI) 591b24–25: 云何修行進。云何修行退。瑜伽師有幾。令人住其中。Compare the corresponding passage in T. 671 (XVI) 520a1–2, very similar to T. 672 except for *pada* c: 何因修行退。何因修行進。教何等人修。令住何等法。However, in the corresponding Sanskrit text (Nanjio 1923: 27 [II.41]), *yogācāra* is not the term that is actually found: *katham vyāvartate yogāt katham yoga pravartate! katham caivamvidhā yoge narā sthāpyā vadāhi me!!*. The sense of people who practice yoga is certainly expressed here, but despite the appearance of the Chinese term 瑜伽師 the Sanskrit technical term *yogācāra* does not occur.

the extent of sacrificing clarity for consistency.<sup>25</sup> But, alas, this is not always and universally the case. In Xuanzang's translation of an *Abhidharmakośabbāṣya* passage quoted below, three types of *yogācāra* are rendered with two terms, *yuqieshi* 瑜伽師 and *guanxingzhe* 觀行者.<sup>26</sup> In another spot, *yuqieshi* 瑜伽師 renders *yogin*.<sup>27</sup> In Xuanzang's translation of the *Mahāyānasamgraha* we find *yuqieshi* 瑜伽師 once each in prose and in verse (at I.60), and *yuqiezhe* 瑜伽者 once in verse. At II.11 we find *guanxhe* 觀者 once, in verse. All of these terms refer, according to the Tibetan translation, to *rnal 'byor pa* = *\*yogin*.<sup>28</sup> This illustration that even the generally consistent Xuanzang was far from entirely systematic and mechanical in his renderings must, I think, seriously shake our confidence in the utility of Chinese translations for sensitive terminological investigations. One of the implications of this fact is that we should be very careful about using, or even refrain entirely from relying upon, passages in Chinese which we cannot confirm with Indic or Tibetan parallels.<sup>29</sup> But of course the key to understanding any term is not primarily etymology or translation equivalents, but use.

All students of Indian thought are at least superficially familiar with the word *Yogācāra* since it, along with *Madhyamaka*, is used to

25. See the remarks in Nagao 1994: I.xi, xiv.

26. Pradhan 1975: 338.2–5 = T. 1558 (XXIX) 117c1–3.

27. Pradhan 1975: 456.20 = T. 1558 (XXIX) 151c5.

28. Actually, the verse occurrence of 瑜伽師 in I.60 is not confirmed by Tibetan, since this verse is not found in the Tibetan translation. See Nagao 1982: 261, n. 5. My remarks here on the *Mahāyānasamgraha* are based on the texts found in Nagao 1982. See now also Nagao 1994, s.v. *yogin*. It is, of course, not absolutely certain that the occurrence in prose of 瑜伽師 could not refer to an original *yogācāra*, and the different rendering in verse could have been intended to differentiate the rendering from that of *yogin*, a form suggested as more likely by metrical constraints (it being less likely that a form in four syllables would be used when an equivalent in two was available), but the Tibetan translation does not support this interpretation.

29. I mean this stricture to apply only to investigations of Indic terminology in texts, not to the study of Buddhist literature or thought in general.

As an example of a passage to which we might otherwise want to refer, see the *\*Ādiviśeṣavibhāgasūtra* 分別緣起初勝法門經 (T. 717 [XVI] 843b6–9): "What is *\*samyak-smṛti*? The Blessed One said: Energetic cultivation of *\*samatha* and *\*vipaśanā* (止觀). The *\*yogācāras* (? 諸瑜伽師) rely on the three marks (? 三相). They always concentrate on those three marks and are not distracted and careless (*\*pramāda*)...." Another version, T. 716 (XVI) 836a29, does not have the term 瑜伽師 / *\*yogācāra*, but it is probable that 合相應 is meant to represent the same term. See Silk 1997 for further references to Chinese passages unconfirmed by parallels.

refer to one of the two main schools of Mahāyāna philosophy; in this sense the term *Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda* is also used.<sup>30</sup> Whether this is the same word as that we are investigating here is a vexing question. Several scholars have investigated the term in this context, and sought to trace the antecedents of the *Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda* school through earlier uses of the term *yogācāra*.<sup>31</sup> Here I am not directly concerned

30. This meaning of *Yogācāra* as a Buddhist philosophical school is naturally also noted by the dictionaries. Ronald Davidson has emphasized to me in personal communication his opinion that there existed no *Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda* school prior to Bhāvaviveka. I will not use the word in such a strict sense, however, but rather to point to the developing tradition of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and of the thinkers Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, and so on.

31. These include Davidson 1985, and the forthcoming work of Nobuyoshi Yamabe. Several Japanese scholars have also addressed the origins of the *Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda* school in this light. Mukai 1978: 269, 270 suggests that the term *Yogācāra* as a school name is directly (直接的に) based on the śāstra called *Yogācārabhūmi*, in the same way that, he asserts, the school called *Vaiśiṣṭika* is based on the (*Mahā-*) *Vibhāṣā*, the Sautrāntika on the sūtras, and the *Madhyamaka* on the *Mūlamadhyamaka kārikās*. What he means is that as *Vaiśiṣṭikas* study the *Vibhāṣā*, *Yogācāras* study the *Yogācārabhūmi*, thence their name. Other Japanese scholars cited by Mukai suggest instead a connection with the practice of yoga (*yogācāra* as a *tatpuruṣa*). As far as I can tell, none of these scholars took a serious look at the history of the term. (Mukai mentions none of the important studies of the term, such as Miyamoto 1932 or Nishi 1939.) Although there is evidence (for example, in Yaśomitra's *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* [Shastri 1971: 15]) for the naming of the *Vaiśiṣṭika* and Sautrāntika, the application of the same logic to the *Madhyamaka* at least seems to me to be in error. Prof. Schmithausen (personal communication) seems open to the idea that such a logic might apply in the case of the *Yogācāra*, although he does not commit himself.

Ui 1958: 34 suggested that the origins of the *Yogācārabhūmi* lie with the *yogācāras* discussed in the *\*Abhidharma-Mahāvibhāṣā* (see too Ui 1965: 372), which is apparently also the view of Mizuno 1956: 228–29, of Fukuhara 1975: 406, and of La Vallée Poussin 1937: 189–190, note 1, who wrote that *yogācāra* designates "a member of a school known by the *Vibhāṣā* and the *Kośa*, which continues in the schools which are connected with Asaṅga." Takasaki 1966: 96 wrote that "*yogācāras* are monks who concentrated mainly on the practice of meditation (*zenkan* 禪觀)," and contrasted them with *Ābhidharmikas*. He went on to suggest that the origins of the *Yogācāra* school are to be sought with Sarvāstivādin *yogācāras* who gave special attention to the practice of the *Avatamsaka* sūtra's "mind only." I do not know if he has developed this view at length elsewhere.

Another approach has been taken by Deleanu, who states (1993: 9–10): "Even if we accept that they originated from a common tradition, which is not totally excluded, we must conclude that the *Vijñānavādins* split from the *Śrāvakayāna* *yogācāras* branch at an early date and evolved in a quite unique way." Deleanu, however, seems not to distinguish between *yogins* and *yogācāras*, and apparently identifies these practitioners as those whose ideas and practices are exposed in early



with the sense of *yogācāra* as denoting "the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school of Buddhist doctrinal speculation." I am, moreover, not able to enter into the question of the possible connections, if any, of the *yogācāra bhikṣu* with the rise of that school. These seem to me interesting problems, but ones I will leave to others to address.<sup>32</sup> Here my main goal is to try to understand who the *yogācāra bhikṣu* is, most especially in Mahāyāna sūtra literature.

I am, to be sure, not the first to have become interested in this term. One of the earliest modern scholars to examine the meaning of the term *yogācāra* was Miyamoto Shōson.<sup>33</sup> Working without reference to Tibetan materials and at a time, more than sixty years ago, before many of the Sanskrit texts now published were available, Miyamoto nevertheless was able to make many important discoveries. He recognized the equivalence of the Chinese transcription-cum-translations *zuochan biqiu* 坐禪比丘 and *yuqieshi* 瑜伽師 as renderings of *yogācāra (bhikṣu)*,<sup>34</sup> and pointed out many of the most important relevant passages in Chinese texts, including the *Śrāvakabhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, now available in Sanskrit but accessible to Miyamoto only in Chinese. Miyamoto's questions centered around an exploration of the history of Buddhist "practice" and the origins of the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school, and in that context he examined the question of who the *yogācāra bhikṣus* were, and why they might be important. He offered the opinion that the term *yogācāra* seems to refer primarily to meditative monks in general (the *zuochan biqiu*), and suggested that groups of these monks were connected for the most part with North-western India, Kashmir, and Gandhāra.<sup>35</sup> Miyamoto's paper made a very auspicious start on the problem. Unfortunately, perhaps because of its uninviting title, which gives no hint as to its true contents, his

*Yogācārabhūmi* texts such as those of Saṅgharakṣa and Dharmatrāta (T. 606 and T. 618). I am not sure why Deleau groups together those who hold such ideas and advocate such practices as "*yogācāras*."

Another study which devotes considerable attention to the issue of Buddhist yoga and the *yogācāra* is Yin 1988: 611–645. I regret that I have not been able to make full use of this work.

32. I hope not to imply that I believe there to be anything illegitimate in speculating on the connection between the *yogācāra bhikṣu* and the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school; this is simply not the task I have set for myself here. For one attempt in this direction, see Hotori 1980.

33. Miyamoto 1932, slightly revised in 1933.

34. Miyamoto 1932: 770.

35. Miyamoto 1932: 773.

research has not been widely influential.<sup>36</sup> At least one scholar, however, appreciated and used the work of Miyamoto, namely Nishi Giyū.

Nishi investigated the place of the *yogācāra* in, primarily, the *\*Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*.<sup>37</sup> His detailed studies seek to identify the particular doctrinal position of the *yogācāra* and to situate him within the world of Abhidharma philosophy, in addition to clarifying the meaning of the term. The highly architectonic, systematic, and self-referential nature of the Abhidharma literature makes any attempt to understand only a portion of it in isolation probably doomed from the outset. Moreover, my own insufficient familiarity with the system makes it impossible for me to present Nishi's discoveries in a simpler form. While I will refer below to what I understand the *Vibhāṣā* to say about the *yogācāra*, here I will merely cite one of Nishi's conclusions,<sup>38</sup> namely that "The *yogācāra* is, in India, a meditator (禪定行者), and should be seen as the precursor of the Chan masters of China."

Another scholar to contribute to the question has been Nishimura Minori who observed, based primarily on some instances of the term in the vinaya literature, and especially the *Abhisamācārikā* of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, that *yogācāra bhikṣu* does not seem to refer to a specialization, as it were, so much as to those monks who are, by the by, engaged in yogic praxis.<sup>39</sup> The *yogācāra bhikṣus* "belong to the same monastic community [as the monks whose behavior annoys them], but they are by no means specialists in practice; it is clear that they are monks who happen to be engaged in yogic practice at the time [the incidents cited took place]." For Nishimura, the Mahāsāṃghikas had the general custom of referring to those monks engaged generally in yogic practice as *yogācāra bhikṣus*.<sup>40</sup>

36. Demiéville 1954: 340, n. 2, referred to Miyamoto's paper, but offered no corollary studies of his own. Nishimura 1974, Mukai 1978, and Kodama et al. 1992–1993 appear to be ignorant of Miyamoto's work. (Kodama et al. 1992–1993, however, do refer to a large number of studies, including: Nishi 1939, 1974, Ui 1965, Fukuhara 1975, and Matsunami 1954.)

37. The titles of Nishi's 1939 and 1974 papers refer to the place of the *yogācāra* in Sectarian Buddhism, but in practice he refers almost exclusively to the voluminous commentary on the Abhidharma, the *Vibhāṣā* T. 1545.

38. Nishi 1974: 361; see also 370.

39. Nishimura 1974: 916.

40. Nishimura 1974: 917.

Western scholars have also noted the term. La Vallée Poussin, for example, remarked as follows:<sup>41</sup>

The Pāli scriptures recognize and admit, alongside of monks of strict observance, an ill-defined category of ascetics (yogins, yogāvacaras, later yogācāras), who are at the same time saints and irregulars, schismatics or heretics. They are referred to as men of the forest (*āraṇyaka*) or of cemeteries (*śmāśānikas*).<sup>42</sup> Doing away with the novitiate and communal living, stringent in their practice of the rigorous rules of asceticism, they are professional solitaries and penitents, and thus thaumaturges.

The use of the term *yogācāra* in the *Yogācārabhūmi* and other, primarily Abhidharmic, texts has been treated by Ronald Davidson in the context of his study of the early Yogācāra school:<sup>43</sup> "Probably the oldest use of the term 'Yogācāra' ... indicates simply a 'yogin' and should be considered identical with that term." Finally, in his study of the Mahāsaṃghika *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, Gustav Roth concludes as follows:<sup>44</sup>

41. La Vallée Poussin 1909: 356. In this regard he offered a note and commented on the passage from the *Mahāvastu* discussed below, and on occurrences of the term *yogāvacara* in Pāli, remarking: "I think that in the *Mahāvastu* ... the Yogācāras, who are spoken of with disfavor, are not the adherents of the doctrine of the Vijñānavāda but rather ascetic thaumaturges." It is rare that one will want to disagree with any conclusion of the great scholar, but as we will see, there does not seem to be any evidence to uphold the claim that *yogācāras* are "ascetic thaumaturges." For a discussion of what might characterize Buddhist "wonder working," see Gómez 1977.

42. The text prints *śmāśānikas*, but this is probably an error.

43. Davidson 1985: 126. On page 184 he says:

The other element in establishing the nature of the fundament and its transformation—or 'replacement'—is the definition surrounding the four-fold purification (*pariśuddhi*) found within the *\*Revatasūtra* and given by Asaṅga in the *Śr[āvaṇa]Bh[ūmi]* as the canonical source for fundamental transformation. There the question is posed concerning the manner of a *yogācāra* becoming one practicing unobstructed meditation (*anirākṛtadhyāyī*). The answer is that a *yogācāra* who practices diligently the correct meditative activity will obtain, touch and come face to face with a) the purity of fundament (*āśrayapariśuddhi*) from the cleansing of all hindrances (*sarvadauṣṭhulyānāṃ pratiprasādbher*), with b) the purity of objective support (*ālambanapariśuddhi*) through the inspection of the objects of knowledge (*jñeyavastupratyavekṣatayā*), with c) the purity of mind (*cittapariśuddhi*) through the elimination of desire (*rāgavirāgāt*), and with d) the purity of gnosis (*jñānapariśuddhi*) through the elimination of ignorance (*avidyāvirāgāt*).

Such a portrayal of the *yogācāra* is, of course, highly systematized and must represent a stage of development subsequent to, or at least distinct from, that represented in the bulk of the sūtra literature.

44. Roth 1970: XLIV.

As the designation of a monk as *yogācāra* or *yogācārin* is not at home in the old Vinaya text of the Hīnayāna trend we can conclude that this term has entered our text from later strata of Buddhist tradition not belonging to the ancient Vinaya. The well confirmed occurrence of *bhikṣur yogācāra* in the Mahāyānist Kāśyapaparivarta as well as the traceability of *yogācāra* in Abhidh[arma]k[ōśa] indicates that it has its origin in the early strata of Mahāyāna Buddhism during the period of transition from Hīnayāna to Mahāyāna.

Setting aside the problem of the Mahāyāna/Hīnayāna dichotomy,<sup>45</sup> I think we will see in the following that Roth's conclusion concerning the origins of the term, that it is a Mahāyānist term evidently, as I understand him, borrowed from Mahāyāna circles by "Hīnayāna" authors, is almost certainly wrong. But he is certainly right about the appearance of the term in one of the oldest Mahāyāna sūtras, the *Kāśyapaparivarta*.

To begin our own investigation, then, let us first take a look at the passages which spawned this study to begin with, those from the *Kāśyapaparivarta* and the closely related *Ratnarāśisūtra*.

The *Kāśyapaparivarta* uses the term in two places:<sup>46</sup> "when a *yogācāra* monk contemplates any object whatsoever, all of them appear to him absolutely void. They appear hollow, empty, without essence." And again:<sup>47</sup> "everywhere a *yogācāra* monk sees perturbations of mind, he practices in order to hold them in check. He holds his mind in check in such a way that it never again leaps out of control." The Chinese versions have a variety of renderings, none of which, at least at first glance, seem to be especially helpful to us in determining the precise meaning of the word, since they all point in the general direction of "practice."<sup>48</sup> As we will see as we go on, however, it may be precisely this lack of precision which is a vital element of the signification of the term *yogācāra bhikṣu*. Finally, the term is not remarked upon in

45. On this issue, see Silk 1994: 1–52.

46. Staël-Holstein 1926: §68: *yogācāro bhikṣur yad yad evāḷambanāṃ manaskaroti tat sarvaṃ asya rīktakam eva khyāti (\*tucchaka, sūnyaka, asāraka)*. The last three terms are suggested on the basis of the Tibetan, as the quotation of the passage (*Madhyānta-vibhāgaṭīkā*, Yamaguchi 1934: 247.12–16), which is missing in the *Kāśyapaparivarta* Sanskrit manuscript, does not contain the sentence.

47. Staël-Holstein 1926: §108: *yogācāro bhikṣur yatra yatraiva cittasya vikāraṃ paśyati tatra tatraivāsya nigrabhāya pratipadyate sa tathā tathā cittam nigrhṇāti yathā na puna prakupyate*.

48. T. 351 (Jin): §68, §108 修行比丘; T. 659 (Maṇḍalasena): §68 行道沙門, §108 行者; T. 310 (Qin): §68 行道比丘, §108 行者; T. 352 (Song): §68 相應行比丘, §108 相應比丘.

the *Kāśyapaparivarta* commentary, and although this is not necessarily significant, it is possible to speculate that the term was well enough known, or unproblematic enough, that no explanation was required.<sup>49</sup> What little we can gather from the context of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* passages suggests that *yogācāra* monks are those involved in meditative contemplation.

The *Ratnarāsisūtra* treats the term—which appears in the form *yogācāra* and *yogācāra bhikṣu* (*dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa*)—at somewhat greater length.<sup>50</sup> It appears in four passages. First of all:<sup>51</sup>

Monks, ... for that intent monk, *yogācāra*, who practices what I have taught, having enjoyed the robes, begging bowl, sleeping mat, and medicaments—that is to say, the personal belongings—[obtained] from donors and benefactors, who sees the faults of *saṃsāra*, sees the impermanence in all conditioned things, understands that all conditioned things are suffering, zealously applies himself to the [fact that] all dharmas lack a self, and comprehends that *nirvāṇa* is calm, even though he consumes mouthfuls [of food] as great as Mount Sumeru [given as] a gift of faith, those offerings of that [gift of faith] are still completely and totally pure.<sup>52</sup>

49. On the other hand, commentaries as a rule often “explain” what requires little explanation, while sometimes overlooking the truly problematic, which is why I say the omission here is not necessarily significant.

50. The Chinese translation of the term in this text presents a very interesting problem, which I discuss in Silk 1997.

51. I translate the Tibetan (nearly identical in the *sūtra* text from the Kanjur and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* text from the Tanjur), which I quote from the text established in my edition, Silk 1994: 408–409: *dge slong dag de la dge slong ldan pa rnal 'byor spyod pa nga'i bstan pa la zbugs pa gang zbig sbyin pa po dang l sbyin bdag las chos gos dang l bsod snyoms dang l mal cha dang l na ba'i gsos sman dang l yo byad rnams yongs su spyad nas 'khor ba'i skyon mthong l 'du byed thams cad mi rtag par mthong l 'du byed thams cad sdug bsngal bar rig l chos thams cad la bdag med par mos l mya ngan las 'das pa zhi bar rtogs pas ni ri rab tsam gyi kham dag gis dad pas byin pa yongs su spyad kyang de'i yon shin tu yongs su dag par 'gyur rol l sbyin pa po dang sbyin bdag gang dag las dad pas byin pa yongs su spyad pa de las de dag gi bsod nams kyi rnam par smin pa 'byor pa chen po dang l phan yon chen por 'gyur rol l de ci'i phyir zhe na l dge slong dag rdzas las byung ba'i bsod nams bya ba'i dngos po rnams las l gang byams pa'i sems la snyom par 'jug pa de mchog yin pa'i phyir rol l.*

The corresponding Sanskrit is quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall 1897–1902: 138.3–8 = MS 68b7–69a1): *yadi bhikṣavo bhikṣur yukto yogācāro mama śikṣāyām prati-pannab sarvvasaṃskāreṣu anityadarśi sarvvasaṃskāraduḥkhaviditaḥ sarvvaadharmeṣu anātmādhimukṭiḥ śāntanirvāṇābhikṣāṃkṣī sumerumātrair ālopaiḥ śraddhādeyaṃ bhuñjīṭy-antaparīśuddhaiva tasya sādakṣiṇā bhavati l yeṣāṃ ca dāyakanān dānapatīnāṃ sakāśāc chraddhādeyaṃ paribhuktaṃ tatas teṣān dāyakadānapatīnā[m] mabarddhikāḥ puṇyavipāko bhavati mahādhyutikaḥ l tat kasmād dbetoḥ l agram idam aupadbhikānāṃ puṇyakriyāva-stūnāṃ yeyam maitracittasamāpattiḥ l.*

52. Or the clause may mean: “the offerings made to him are still completely and

When [that monk] enjoys a gift of faith from donors and benefactors, the maturation of merit from that [gift] for those donors and benefactors has great power, and the benefit [to them] is great. Why? Because, monks, the attainment of a friendly attitude is the best of the material objects related to meritorious action.

Here again we would suspect that the *yogācāra* monk is a meditator, and also—perhaps even merely by virtue of that status—a special source of merit as a recipient of alms. The latter point is emphasized in a further passage:<sup>53</sup>

When this teaching had been preached, five-hundred *yogācāra* monks thought: “It would not be right if we were to enjoy the gift of faith while our keeping of the precepts is not completely pure,” and they fell [away from the precepts] and returned to the home life. Then, a few other monks criticized them saying: “It is very bad that these *yogācāras*, heroic (*\*māhātmya*)<sup>54</sup> monks, have fallen away from the teaching.”

It is interesting that it is not meditation that is emphasized here, but rather strict adherence to the monastic rule that produces merit rendering one fit to receive alms. But in the following passage, meditation is obviously an integral part of the *yogācāra*'s practice. That the *yogācāra* monk requires quiet and perhaps even special treatment is stressed as follows:<sup>55</sup>

totally pure.” The referent of the pronoun *tasya/de'i* is not clear. The Chinese translation is not strictly parallel; see Silk 1994: 566.

53. Silk 1994: 435: *bstan pa 'di bshad ba na dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa lnga brgyas bdag cag tshul kbrims yongs su ma dag bzbin du dad pas byin pa spyad par gyur na mi rung zhes nyams par byas te slar kbyim du dong ngo l l de la dge slong gzhan dag cig 'di skad du dge slong che ba'i bdag nyid can rnal 'byor spyod pa 'di dag bstan pa las nyams pa ni shin tu ma legs so zhes 'phyar'o l l.*

54. It is not clear to me what the qualification *\*māhātmya* indicates here, and the translation, which was kindly suggested by Gregory Schopen, is provisional.

55. Again I translate the Tibetan, Silk 1994: 439–440: *'od srung de la dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa gang yin pa de dag la dge slong zhal ta byed pas 'thun pa'i 'tsbog chas dang l na ba'i gsos sman dang l yo byad rnams sbyin par bya'o l l dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa des phyogs ga la gnas pa'i sa phyogs der dge slong zhal ta byed pa des sgra chen po dang l skad drag po mi dbyung zbing byed du yang mi gzbug go l dge slong zhal ta byed pas dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa de bsrung zbing mal cha yang sbyar bar bya'o l l kha zas bsod pa dang l yi gar 'ong ba dang l rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa dang 'thun pa'i bza' ba dang bca' ba rnams sbyin par bya'o l l dge slong de la dge slong 'di ni de bzbin gshegs pa'i bstan pa rton pa'i phyir gnas pa yin te l de la bdag gis rjes su 'thun pa'i yo byad thams cad mang du sbyar bar bya'o snyam du shin tu phangs pa'i 'du shes bskyed bar bya'o l l.*

The corresponding Sanskrit is found in Bendall 1897–1902: 55.13–18 (= MS 32b7–33a2; see above n. 7): *tatra kāśyapa yo bhikṣur yogācāro bhavati l tasya tena vaijāryakareṇa bhikṣuṇā 'nulomikāny upakaraṇāny upasamhartavyāni glānapratyaya-bhaiṣajyapariśkāraś ca l yasmimś ca pradeśe sa yogācāro bhikṣuḥ prativasati tasmimś pradeśe*



Now, Kāśyapa, the superintending monk should give to those who are *yogācāra* monks appropriate paraphernalia, medicine to cure the sick, and personal belongings. In whatever place that *yogācāra* monk is dwelling the superintending monk should not cry aloud and yell nor permit [others] to do so. The superintending monk should protect that *yogācāra* monk and also provide him with a bed. He should give him sumptuous food, savories and hard food and soft food suitable for [one in] the stage of the practice of yoga (*yogācārabbūmi*).<sup>56</sup> It occurs to that [superintending] monk: "This [*yogācāra*] monk lives in order to promote the Tathāgata's teaching. I should generously provide him with all the appropriate personal belongings," and he should think him very dear.

We will see below that at least one vinaya text confirms the impression one receives from this passage about the conditions under which a *yogācāra* would flourish. Finally, the yogic aspects of the *yogācāra* monk's practice are emphasized in the following:<sup>57</sup>

If one truly comprehensively reflects on this body as a disadvantage, he correctly comprehends. And making his mind single-pointed he will become mindful and constantly attentive, and thus the stage of generating the first Concentration will be his. Having obtained the Concentration, if he desires the bliss of Concentration he dwells for the space of one day, or two days, or from three days up to seven days with the bliss of Concentration as his food. If, even entered into yoga, he is not able to generate the Concentration, then gods, nāgas, and yakṣas renowned for their superior knowledge will offer food to that *yogācāra* monk, striving in that manner, who dwells in the Teaching.

The monks characterized in the *Ratnarāśi* as *yogācāra* monks are clearly intent upon their practice. That these monks engage in meditative cultivation is explicitly stated in the passage just quoted, in which we find a discussion of the importance of the first Concentration (*dhyaṇa*).

Now, while we can certainly feel confident at this point that we more or less understand the term, since its etymology and the uses

*noccaśabdah kartavyaḥ | rakṣitavyo vaiyāvṛtyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā yogācāro bhikṣuḥ | śayyāsānopastambhānāśya kartavyā | prāṇitāni ca saṃpreyāṇi yogācārabbūmyanukūlāni khādānīyabhojanīyāny upanāmayitavyāni |*

56. On this important term, see Silk 1997.

57. Silk 1994: 483: *de lus 'di la skyon du yang dag pa ji lta ba bzhin du so sor rtog pa na tshul bzhin la zbugs pa de | sems rtse gcig tu 'gyur zhing dran pa dang ldan la | shes bzhin dang ldan pas bsam gtan dang po bskyed pa'i gnas gang yin ba de yod par 'gyur te | des bsam gtan thob nas bsam gtan gyi bde ba 'dod pa na | nyi ma gcig gam | nyi ma gnyis sam | nyi ma gsum nas nyi ma bdun gyi bar du bsam gtan gyi bde ba'i zas kyi gnas so | gal te 'di lta' rnal 'byor la zbugs pa bsam gtan bskyed par mi nus na | de lta' brtson zhing rnal 'byor spyod pa'i dge slong chos la gnas pa de la mngon par shes pa mngon par shes pa'i lha dang | klu dang | gnod sbyin dag kha zas 'bul bar 'gyur ro |*

we have discovered seem to be in accord, we still do not have a good appreciation of the term's scope and importance. For it is a word which appears in many different genres of Buddhist literature, and may indeed be more important than it might at first have seemed.

In default of any reliable chronology of Indian Buddhist literature, I will survey the available materials genre by genre.<sup>58</sup> The first important fact we must note is that there do not appear to be any references at all to the term *yogācāra* (with or without *bhikṣu/bhikkhu*) in the canonical Āgama/Nikāya corpus.<sup>59</sup> The word *yogācāra* appears in fact to be missing entirely from the Pāli canon,<sup>60</sup> the only canonical corpus complete in an Indic language, and as far as I know our term never appears in Indic language fragments of canonical material from,

58. Of course, there is some sort of implicit relative chronology hiding in the wings which motivated the ordering of the following discussion, but neither the absolute nor the relative chronology of our sources will be critical for what follows. Therefore, whatever problems there are with chronology are not of primary concern in this context.

59. It is very difficult if not impossible to state categorically that the term does not appear in the Chinese Āgamas. We have, first of all, no comprehensive index to these materials, and second of all, even if we did, we would not know with any certainty whether a given Chinese term should correspond to the Indic *yogācāra*. The stricture that the term is missing from the canonical Āgama/Nikāya corpus, then, must be understood with this proviso.

In this context we should take note of a passage in the *Vibhāṣā* T. 1545 (XXVII) 533a23–b2 which seems to quote "a sūtra" in which the interlocutor Anāthapiṇḍada asks the Buddha a question about *yogācāras* (瑜伽師). However, as far as I know, the passage has not been identified, and it cannot, at this point, be accepted as a genuine Āgamic use of the term. A passage from Vasumitra's *\*Vibhāṅga* (分別論) including the term 瑜伽師 and explaining the sūtra quotation is also quoted at 533b9.

60. The only exceptions to this absence of *yogācāra* and the like in canonical Pāli seem to be due to wrong writings for the term *yoggācariya*, a term apparently equivalent to *yogyācārya* and meaning something like "groom, trainer." See AN iii.28,17, reading *yoggācariyo*, with variant *yogācariyo*. MN iii.97,8 reads *yogācariyo* without variant, and MN iii.222,29, SN iv.176,18, and Thag 1140 read *yoggācariyo* without variants. It should be noted, of course, that the PTS editions are not critical editions, and the absence of a variant reading cannot be taken too seriously. In Sanskrit the term *yogyācārya* appears in *Arthaśāstra* 2.30.42 in the sense of "trainer."

It is also extremely interesting that the term appears already in the Second Minor Rock Edict of Aśoka in the form *yūg[ly]ācariyāni*. (A careful synoptic version is found in Andersen 1990: 120.) For some comments on this term, see Bloch 1950: 151, n. 18. Norman 1966: 116–117 = 1990: 80–81 suggested that the word in MRE II means "teacher of yoga," but this seems to me quite unlikely.

I have discussed a parallel term which occurs in late Pāli, namely *yogāvacara*, in Silk 1997. To this paper please make the following corrections: n. 3: *acara* → *avacara*. n. 61: *Abhidhammathasaṅgha* → *Abhidhammatthasaṅgha*.

for example, Central Asia.<sup>61</sup> Given the absence of the relevant term in the canonical Āgama/Nikāya corpus, let us begin our genre-wise survey with the vinaya literature.

While it is entirely absent from the Pāli Vinaya,<sup>62</sup> we do find the term *yogācāra bhikṣu* in the *Abhisamācārikā*, a portion of the Mahā-sāṃghika Vinaya for which we have an extant Indic text. The Chinese translation generally understands this term as “meditating/meditator monk,” *zuochan biqiu* 坐禪比丘,<sup>63</sup> or even and perhaps more literally, “monk engaged in/dedicated to seated meditation.” It is evident that those referred to in the *Abhisamācārikā* as *yogācāra bhikṣu* are those who require a quiet and undisturbed atmosphere for their meditative practice. But we have raised a crucial point here, alluded to above in discussing Nishimura’s views: which of the two possibilities apparently inherent in *zuochan biqiu* 坐禪比丘 (which is after all an *interpretation* of *yogācāra bhikṣu*) is preferable? Is this to be understood as a vocational designation—meditator monk—or as a specification of a state—a

61. But see below nn. 78 and 136. Since these Central Asian manuscript fragments are as yet unidentified, there does exist some possibility, however small, that they belong to Āgamic texts.

62. Schopen has several times (for example, 1992: 2; 1995: 108) remarked that this vinaya seems in many ways to be remarkable and *not* characteristic of vinaya literature in general.

63. As pointed out by de Jong 1974: 65. We may refer to the following instances (Sanskrit from the edition of Jinananda 1969): 106.9–107.11 = T. 1425 (XXII) 506b28–c10. At 106.9–12 = 506b28–c1 we have: *aparo dāni bhikṣuḥ yogācāro vaidehake parvate niṣaṇṇo cittaṃ samādhayisyāmīti* | *aparo dāni bhikṣuḥ āgacchiya tasya purato sthito* | *tasya dāni tena nīvaranena cittaṃ samādhānaṃ na gacchati* | *etaṃ prakaraṇaṃ so yogācāro bhagavato ārocaye* | .... = 爾時、比丘在帝釋石室山邊坐禪。時、有比丘在前立住。坐禪比丘心不得定。諸比丘以是因緣往白世尊。These *yogācāra bhikṣus* are annoyed by other monks standing in front of them and disturbing their meditations. The same grammatical constructions are found in 107.13–109.3 = T. 1425 (XXII) 506c19–507a3, where the *yogācāra bhikṣus* are disturbed by flapping sandals (*tālapāduka*). At 203.5 (disturbed by smells of extinguished lamps), 213.3–4 (disturbed by sounds of meditation mats being folded), and 219.1 (disturbed by sounds of sneezing) = T. 1425 (XXII) 512c14, 513b9, and 513c4, *yogācārā bhikṣū* = 諸坐禪比丘。However, at 215.1–2 (disturbed by sounds of sandals being knocked together), 217.8 (disturbed by sounds of coughing), 220.15 (disturbed by sounds of scratching), and 222.9 (disturbed by sounds of yawning) = T. 1425 (XXII) 513b18, b26, c12, and c21, *yogācārā bhikṣū* = 諸比丘。The occurrence of the term in Sanskrit at 226.4 (disturbed by sounds of flatulence) is apparently not rendered in Chinese, which is somewhat more terse than the Indic text at this point. (I am aware that the reliability of Jinananda’s edition is suspect, but in the absence of any alternative I have accepted his readings as they stand.) On these and the Mahā-sāṃghika *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* passages, see Nishimura 1974.

monk engaged (perhaps temporarily) in meditational activities? This is a question that we will have to consider, while keeping in mind that there need not be only one correct answer.

Our term also appears in another text of the same Mahā-sāṃghika school, the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. Gustav Roth discusses the term, and quotes it from *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* in the context of a story of the group of six nuns who attend a theatrical performance. Roth translates the relevant sentence:<sup>64</sup> “They (the nuns) stand silently, like *those whose conduct emanates from disciplined concentration*.” The Chinese translation has 默然似如坐禪人.<sup>65</sup> Clearly *zuochanren* 坐禪人 is intended here as a translation of *yogācārāḥ*. Both Roth and the more recent student of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, Édith Nolot, then, have understood *yoga* here as meaning “disciplined concentration” and *yogācārā* as “nonnes à la conduite réfléchie,” respectively. The Chinese translation, however, apparently takes the term to refer explicitly to the practice of seated meditation. An exact parallel to this passage in the Mahā-sāṃghika Vinaya has the group of six monks watch a musical performance “like *zuochan biqiu* 坐禪比丘.”<sup>66</sup>

The same term, *yogācārā*, is found in another passage in the same vinaya, where it is used to contrast good with ill-behaved nuns. As Roth has pointed out, corresponding to *yogācārā bhikṣuṇī* the Chinese has only “good nuns.”<sup>67</sup> In yet another passage we have the same equivalence in Chinese.<sup>68</sup> Roth suggests that “No doubt the nuns are not characterized here as the followers of the *yogācāra* system.” This is quite correct, I believe, if by “the *yogācāra* system” Roth intends to

64. Roth 1970: XLIII–XLIV. §238 *tāyo dāni tūṣṇikās tiṣṭhanti yogācārā iva*. Roth’s translation is similar to that of Nolot 1991: 299, “elles restaient silencieuses comme des *nonnes à la conduite réfléchie*.” (Emphasis added to both quotations. Strictly speaking, Nolot should of course have placed “nonnes” within brackets, since no such word occurs in the text.) Does Roth’s translation imply that he understands *yogācāra* as a *babuvrīhi* based on an ablative *tatpuruṣa*?

65. T. 1425 (XXII) 540b22. Hirakawa 1982: 344 rendered this: “(the bhikṣuṇīs) kept their mouths closed, and sat as if they were meditating.” This translation must be corrected in light of the Indic text.

66. T. 1425 (XXII) 494a9. There does not seem to be any similar expression in the other parallel passages cited by Sasaki 1991 in his valuable study of vinaya rules on monks and musical performances.

67. Roth 1970: §243. Chinese at T. 1425 (XXII) 541c2 has 善比丘尼。See the translation in Nolot 1991: 308.

68. Roth 1970: §248. Chinese at T. 1425 (XXII) 542c18. See the translation in Nolot 1991: 316.

refer to the philosophical school of that name, the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda. He continues, "In the Vinaya context, *yogācāra* qualifies nuns of mentally well disciplined conduct." At least some of our evidence, however, suggests that we might be somewhat more precise.

Since we lack corresponding Sanskrit materials for other sections of the vinaya of this school, we cannot suggest with the same degree of confidence that the same Chinese terminology in additional passages in Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya texts represents the same Indic technical terms. But if we assume that the correspondences are more or less standard within the same translation, then we also have several other references to *yogācāra bhikṣus* in the same vinaya.<sup>69</sup> When we turn to an examination of the Vinayas of other schools, however, we are faced with a more serious problem. We have access to most of these materials only in Chinese. Now, the term *zuochan biqiu* 坐禪比丘 and similar expressions *do* occur, but in default of any Indic language (or Tibetan) materials with which to compare the Chinese translations, we are unable to clarify whether that translation represents the terminology in question. Moreover, it would be mere circularity to adduce the Chinese term *zuochan biqiu* in support of the hypothesis that *yogācāra bhikṣu* means a meditating or meditation monk. I have pointed out above the danger of relying on unconfirmed Chinese evidence in terminological studies, and therefore refrain from discussing the exclusively Chinese vinaya evidence here.<sup>70</sup>

A final example of the designation *yogācāra* in a vinaya or vinaya-like text is found in an anomalous passage in the *Mahāvastu*. There the spiritual aspirant is advised to avoid *yogācāras*.<sup>71</sup> "If they are endowed

69. In the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, T. 1425 (XXII) 268b1, we find 坐禪比丘, who apparently meditate in darkness. At 468c7 the meaning is not clarified. At 482b3–5 we have monks walking about in wooden shoes disturbing meditating monks, 坐禪比丘.

70. In Silk 1997 I point out some passages from Chinese vinaya texts in which the term 坐禪比丘 appears.

71. Senart 1882: i.120.7–9: *caturbbi bho jinaputra ākārair dhuta[guṇa]dhara bodhisattvā bodhāye ye prañibhenti pañcamāyān bhūmau vartamānāḥ śaṣṭhyān bhūmau vivartanti | katamehi caturbbi | samyak sambuddhānuśāsane pravrajitvā yogācārehi sārddham sambhuvan kurvanti*. [Read *saṃstavān* for *sambhuvan*, with BHSD s.v. *saṃbhava* (and as suggested already by Senart 1882: i.469)?]

Jones 1949: i.94 rendered: "O son of the Conqueror and my pious friend, there are four ways in which Bodhisattvas who have made a vow to win enlightenment in the fifth *bhūmi* lapse and fail to reach the sixth. What are the four ways? Though the Bodhisattvas have taken up the religious life in the Buddha's instruction, they yet join forces with the Yogācāras."

with four characteristics, Son of the Victor [Mahākāśyapa], upholder of the dhuta ascetic purification practices,<sup>72</sup> bodhisattvas in the fifth stage who make a vow to attain awakening turn back from the sixth stage. What are the four? 1) Having renounced the world in the instruction of the perfectly awakened buddha, they associate together with *yogācāras*." This passage contrasts rather sharply with the usual positive representations of *yogācāras*, and has occasioned much discussion. As indicated above, La Vallée Poussin thought the reference was to wonder-working ascetics, while Davidson has suggested that "From this use we see the graduation to the usage of *yogācāra* indicating a Buddhist *yogin*, specifically a monk."<sup>73</sup> It seems therefore that Davidson thinks the meaning of the term in the *Mahāvastu* (and other earlier materials?) is that of a non-Buddhist yogin. Yet other scholars, undoubtedly wrongly, have viewed the *Mahāvastu* passage as a reference to the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school.<sup>74</sup> However, we should keep several things in mind. First, the text does not specify that these

Leumann and Shiraishi 1957: 93 have: "Auf vier Arten, mein lieber Sieger-sohn(!), machen o du in den Dhuta-Tugenden Erprobter, die Bodhisattva's, welche zur (Erlangung der) Bodhi (ihren) Prañidhāna(-Wunsch) äußern (und) sich auf der fünften Stufe befinden, von der sechsten Stufe Rückschritte (d.h. auf vier Arten gelangen die Bodhisattva's durch Rückschritte aus der sechsten Stufe in die fünfte). Auf welche vier (Arten)? (1) Nachdem sie in der Unterweisung der (oder eines) Vollerleuchteten als Mönche eingetreten sind, pflegen sie Umgang mit den Yogācāra(-Anhängern)."

72. The text's reading *dhutadharma*, which I have emended, is troublesome. However, given the parallel usages at Senart 1882: i.66.16, 71.12, 105.3, and 120.11, the term must clearly be a vocative. Prof. Schmithausen (to whom I owe these references) suggests the possibility that we should read instead *\*dhutagunadhara*, as an epithet of Mahākāśyapa, which would indeed be quite fitting, and which I have adopted.

73. Davidson 1985: 127.

74. Senart 1882: i.469 remarked: "The general sense of the portion of the sentence *yogācārehi* and so on is not uncertain: communication, joining together with the Yogācāras is represented as if criminal and as bringing about a downfall in the spiritual life." Senart goes on, however, in a way which indicates that he understood the term Yogācāra to refer to the philosophical school of that name. Jones 1949: i.94, note 1, also seems to have thought so, as did Edgerton in BHSD s.v. *yogācāra*. This understanding was already explicitly rejected by Shāstri 1931: 837. Miyamoto 1932: 790–791 stated that while it is clear that the passage does *not* refer to followers of the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda, he was unsure whether the reference was to "old *yogācāras*" or to non-Buddhist *yogins*, although he tended toward the opinion that the text is thinking of groups of *yogācāras* related to Dārṣṭāntikas, for reasons having to do with the doctrinal contents of the other three points mentioned in the passage. Nishimura 1974: 917 also seems to follow this approach, since he understands the

*yogācāras* are monks, or even that they are Buddhists.<sup>75</sup> Second, it is certainly possible that this text is expressing a dissenting view about meditation or about specialists in meditation (if indeed this is how *yogācāra* is to be understood). Since this negative attitude seems to be unique in the texts I have examined, it is difficult to draw any immediate conclusions, but we should be sensitive to the anomalous nature of this passage.

Let us turn now to the Abhidharma literature, in which again the term occurs fairly frequently, particularly in the *\*Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*. The occurrences of the term in this text have been extensively studied by Nishi Giyū, and perhaps more accessibly for Western scholars, noted by Davidson.<sup>76</sup> For the *Vibhāṣā*, a *yogācāra* may be a śrāvaka, pratyekabuddha, or buddha, a *śaikṣa* or *asaikṣa*,<sup>77</sup> and indeed even a *prthagjana* may be a *yogācāra*.<sup>78</sup> The same idea is found in Saṅgharakṣa's *Yogācārabhūmi*.<sup>79</sup> Apparently *yogācāras* may be found

reference to be to the same sort of practice mentioned in item three of the passage, *śamathavipaśyanābhāvanā*.

75. To be sure, it would, however, be even more interesting if the reference were not to Buddhists since, as I have indicated, I know of no evidence that the term *yogācāra* is ever used to refer to non-Buddhist practitioners.

It is worth mentioning one suggestion which, as far I know, has not been offered before. Prof. Nagao has tentatively asked whether one might read not *pravrajitvā yogācārehi*, but rather *pravrajitvā-ayogācārehi*. Aside from the fact that the term *\*ayogācāra* seems to be otherwise unattested, I see no prima facie reason why this should not be possible.

76. Nishi 1939, 1974. Combining the references in Davidson 1985: 128 (which seem to be based on the entries in the published index to the Taishō edition) with those of Nishi 1939 and 1974, and adding a few of my own observations, the following *partial* list of occurrences of the term 瑜伽師 in the *Vibhāṣā* may be offered: T. 1545 (XXVII) 13ab, 38b25–27, 47a22, 186a7, 205b11ff., 223c14, 237a27, 238c19–21, 276a10, 289a10–15, 316c–318a, 338b–339a, 341a15–16, 385a24–b7, 404b17, 25, 407a4–b15, 414c25, 417c12–18a1, 422b6, 423b1, 433a3, 433b2, 439b11–12, 512c28, 527c16–20, 528a14, 529b1–6, 533a29–b8, 534a19ff., 536a29, 537b6, 540c11, 704c1–705b11, 775b3, 766b2–24, 816c1–3, 832a22, 834c11, 840a1–13, 842b4, 879c23–26, 880b14, 898a7, 899b8, 905b10–18, 938b14–22, 939a–40c. (Matsunami 1954: 159 says the term appears in more than 60 places in the text, but he provides no list.) Davidson also refers to the *Samgītiparyāya* T. 1536 (XXVI) 446a1.

77. T. 1545 (XXVII) 417c12–14, and 534ab, Miyamoto 1932: 768, and Nishi 1939: 227–28. In the first passage, the “three *yogācāras*” 三瑜伽師 are referred to; in the old *Vibhāṣā* T. 1546 (XXVIII) 313b16–18, the same term is rendered “three types of practitioner” 三種行人.

78. T. 1545 (XXVII) 341a15–21, Nishi 1939: 228–30, 1974: 364. It is possible that the same thing is being said in an unidentified Turfan collection Sanskrit manuscript

anywhere.<sup>80</sup> Those who perform the *aśubha* meditations and contemplate the unsatisfactoriness of saṃsāra are referred to as *yogācāra*,<sup>81</sup> but in general the term seems to be used generically for “practitioner.” In fact, at least in some passages it seems to occur in free variation with *xingzhe* 行者 (“practitioner”), *xiuguan xingzhe* 修觀行者 (“one who practices the cultivation of visualization/contemplation”), and *xiudingzhe* 修定者 (“one who cultivates concentration”).<sup>82</sup> Davidson suggests that in almost all the occurrences of the term *yogācāra* in the *Vibhāṣā* it means “master meditator,” although he also adduces three cases in which he suggests it refers to the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school.<sup>83</sup> It would seem, however, that since even a *śaikṣa* and *prthagjana* might be a *yogācāra*, “master meditator” is not really an apt rendering, given that mastery implies some sort of rather high attainment. There are clear indications that this is not how the term is being used in the *Vibhāṣā*. Since one of any degree of attainment, from the rank beginner up to and including a buddha himself, may be styled *yogācāra*, the generic rendering “practitioner” or the simple “meditator” is much more likely to be accurate.

fragment (Waldschmidt 1971: 139, SHT 889, a.B.v), in which one partial line reads: ///[ta]tra yo yogācārah [plṛ[th]agjanaḥ śaikṣa . . ///.

79. T. 606 (XV) 182c3 = T. 607 (XV) 231b4–5: *yogācāras* may be *prthagjana*, *śaikṣa*, or *asaikṣa*. See Demiéville 1954: 398–399.

80. T. 1545 (XXVII) 704b28–c1 refers to southern, northern, and ubiquitous *yogācāras*: 北方諸瑜伽師, 南方諸瑜伽師, and 一切處諸瑜伽師. I doubt, however, that we should go so far as Fukuhara 1975: 404, who suggests identifying these “southern *yogācāras*” with the *yogāvacaras* of the *Yogāvacara's Manual* and the *Visuddhimagga* (two texts in which, in any case, the respective uses of the term *yogāvacara* may have considerably different referents; see Silk 1997).

81. T. 1545 (XXVII) 839b–840a, Nishi 1939: 238. It seems likely that here and in some other passages the *aśubha* meditation is intended to be emblematic for all meditation practice.

82. T. 1545 (XXVII) 404b–405a. Nishi 1939: 225–226 suggests that there is in fact no essential difference between these terms, and that they may all stand for either *yogācāra* or *yogin*. At T. 1545 (XXVII) 938b 瑜伽師 is apparently equivalent to 修行者, used in the context of the four *smṛtyupasthānas*. See Nishi 1939: 238.

83. Davidson 1985: 128. The three cases in which the term refers to the school he locates as T. 1545 (XXVII) 815c11, 682b2, 795c9–12. Nishi 1939: 261 does not seem to take the final passage, at least, in this meaning, and at 682b2 (Nishi 1939: 262–263) he opposes the *yogācāras* to Ābhidharmikas. Further on (263–264) Nishi is reluctant to speculate on the relationship between the *yogācāras* whose opinions are referred to in the *Vibhāṣā* and the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school. For Matsunami 1954: 160, on the other hand, “The *Vibhāṣā's* *yogācāra* is a sect (派) connected to mainly yogic practice.”

When we turn to the *Abhidharmakośabbhāṣya*, we find what may be a somewhat more precise or restricted usage. For example, we read:<sup>84</sup>

In that regard the *yogācāras* say: A *rūpa* that is the object of *samādhi* is produced for the meditator (*dhyāyīn*) by the force of his *samādhi*. It is invisible because it is not within the domain of the visual sense. It is without resistance because it does not obstruct space. You may think: Now, how [can] that be *rūpa*? This is the same as in the case of the *avijñapti*. As for what was said [at *Abhidharmakośa* IV.4a, namely] that [*avijñapti* exists as a substance], because [a sūtra] speaks of a *rūpa* which is free from the depravities, the *yogācāras* say that this very *rūpa* in question here, produced through the power of *samādhi*, is free from the depravities when it is [produced] in a *samādhi* which is free from the depravities.

Yāsomitra's *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* comments on this passage:<sup>85</sup>

The *yogācāra* who is actualizing the [noble] path acquires such a mental intention and physical basis that he acquires a morality free from the depravities just like [his] correct view. When he is in that state he dwells in a state of natural morality. Or: those masters maintain that even in *samādhi* without depravities there is such a type of *rūpa*.

As La Vallée Poussin remarks, "It turns out from the *Vyākhyā* that the term *Yogācāra* does not refer here to the adept of a certain philosophical school, but simply to the ascetic."<sup>86</sup>

84. Pradhan 1975: 197.5–8, ad IV.4ab: *tatra yogācārā upadiṣanti | dhyāyīnām samādhi-  
viśayo rūpaṃ samādhiprabhāvād utpadyate | cakṣurindriyāviśayatvāt anidarśanam | deśānā-  
varāṇatvād apratigham iti | atha matam | katham idānīm tat rūpaṃ iti | etad avijñaptau  
samānam | yad apy uktam anāsravarūpakter iti tad eva samādhiprabhāvasambhūtaṃ rūpaṃ  
anāsrave samādhāv anāsravaṃ varṇayanti yogācārāḥ |* Cp. *Dīghanikāya* (PTS ed.)  
iii.217,23–24. My translation is deeply indebted to the help I received from Nobuyoshi  
Yamabe and Prof. Schmithausen.

85. Shastri 1971: 583–584: *mārgaṃ sammukhikurvāṇo yogācāras tadrūpaṃ āśayaṃ  
cāśrayaṇ ca pratilabbhate yat samyagdr̥ṣṭivād anāsravaṃ śīlaṃ pratilabbhate | yasmin sati  
prakṛtiśīlatāyām santiṣṭhate | athavā anāsrave 'pi samādhau tad evamvidhaṃ rūpaṃ ta  
ācāryā icchanti |*

86. La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931: iv.18, n. 1. In the same note La Vallée Poussin  
further remarks that Saeki Kyokuga 1887 has a long note on the term *yogācāra* (kan  
13.7a–8a, reprint 557–559). In fact, although I do not know if this has been pointed  
out before, the note consists almost entirely of quotations from the following: 瑜伽  
論記 T. 1828 (XLII) 311c12–19, 312c10–12, 成唯識論述記 T. 1830 (XLIII) 272c6–15,  
瑜伽論略纂 T. 1829 (XLIII) 2b3–5 (? paraphrase?), 大毘盧遮那成佛經疏 T. 1796  
(XXXIX) 601c28–29, and finally two references to the first and third *juan* of the  
same text. Note that the opinion of La Vallée Poussin, that here *yogācāra* does not  
refer to the *Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda*, is contradicted by Griffiths 1986: 173, n. 1. In  
fact, Prof. Schmithausen suggests the possibility that the doctrine being referred to  
in this passage might actually be one upheld by some *Yogācāras*, referring to  
Schmithausen 1976: 239, with n. 5, and Bhattacharya 1957: 68.14.

Another and perhaps more important passage occurs later in the  
*Abhidharmakośabbhāṣya*.<sup>87</sup>

The *yogācāra* who cultivates this [contemplation on] the disgusting is  
said to be of three types: a beginner, a master,<sup>88</sup> and one who has gone  
beyond mental reflection. ...

First of all, the *yogācāra* who wants to cultivate the [contemplation on]  
the disgusting fixes his mind on a limb of his body, on his big toe, his  
forehead, or wherever it pleases him to do so. By progressive zealous  
application of attention there [on that respective limb, he visualizes] the  
putrefaction and dropping off of his flesh [from the bone], and so purifies  
the bone [until finally] he sees [his body] as entirely a collection of bones.  
And in just the same way, in order to extend his zealous application of  
attention he zealously applies his attention to [visualize] a second [skeleton],  
until he progressively zealously applies his attention [to visualize his]  
monastery, the park [around it], the region, and [finally] the whole earth,  
surrounded by the sea, as filled with skeletons. And yet again, he contracts  
[his attention] until he zealously applies his attention to [visualize] himself  
alone as a collection of bones, in order to concentrate his mind. After so  
much time, it is said, [the contemplation on] the disgusting will come to  
be perfected. This is the beginner *yogācāra*....

And again, in order to further concentrate his mind, leaving aside  
[from his visualization] the bones of the feet of that collection of bones,  
he contemplates the rest. In this way gradually he [continues] until,  
leaving half of his skull aside he contemplates [only the top] half of his  
skull. This one is a master....

87. Pradhan 1975: 338.2–20 (VI.10–11ab; I omit the verses in the following): *sa  
punar ayam aśubhām bhāvayan yogācāras trividha ucyate | ādikarmikāḥ kṛtaparijāyo  
'tikrāntamanaskārāḥ ca | ... aśubhām bhāvayitukāma ādito yogācārāḥ | svāṅgāyave cittam  
nibadhnāti pādāṅguṣṭhe lalāte yatra [v] āśyābhiraṭiḥ | sa tatra māṃsakledap[ā]tādhimokṣa-  
krameṇāsthi viśodhayan sakalām asthisamkalām paśyati | tathaiva ca punar dvitīyām  
adhimucyate yāvad viḥārāramakṣetrakrameṇa samudraparyantām pṛthivīm asthisamkalā-  
pūrnām adhimucyate 'dhimokṣābhivardhanārtham | punaś ca samkṣīpan yāvad ekām eva  
svām asthisamkalām adhimucyate cittasamkṣepārtham | iyatā kila kālenāśubhā pariniṣpannā  
bhavati | ayam ādikarmiko yogācārāḥ | ... sa punaḥ cittasamkṣepaviśeṣārtham tasyām  
asthisamkalāyām pādāsthīni hitvā śeṣam manasikaroti | evam krameṇa yāvat kapālasya-  
rdham hitvā 'rdham manasikaroti [! ayam] kṛtaparijāyāḥ | ... so 'rdham api kapālasya  
muktva bhruvor madhye cittam dhārayati | ayam kilāśubhāyām atikrāntamanaskāro  
yogācārāḥ |* [The emendation of °pīta° to °pāta° is based on Tib. *sha myags shing zag  
par mos pa* and Xuanzang's 皮肉爛墮. I owe this emendation, as the other corrections  
in this and the following passage, and numerous corrections of my translations of  
the *Abhidharmakośa* texts, to Prof. Schmithausen. Harunaga Isaacson has also given  
me valuable advice about this passage.]

For a French translation, see La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931: vi.150–51. This  
passage is commented upon in the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* T. 1545 (XXVII)  
205b10ff. See n. 89 for Yāsomitra's remarks.

88. See BHSD s.v. *parijaya*.



And again, leaving aside even the half-skull [as an object of contemplation], one places his attention between the eyebrows. This is the *yogācāra* who has gone beyond mental reflection on the disgusting.

Yaśomitra's commentary does not add much to the above discussion.<sup>89</sup> It is clear that in this conception of the *yogācāra*, he is a meditator who devotes himself to cultivation of the contemplation of the disgusting. It is not specified, however, whether this should be treated as a vocational designation.

Before we turn to an examination of Mahāyāna sūtra materials, we should note several other Sanskrit texts in which the term occurs. The Sanskrit "Yogalehrbuch" published by Dieter Schlingloff, a text which seems to be closely related to Central Asian meditative practices, uses the term many times. Schlingloff consistently renders *yogācāra* with *Yogin* (treating the latter as a German word), although in fact *yogin* also appears in the same text numerous times (but the two never appear side by side). While provisionally it is best not to treat the two terms as identical, despite their obvious relation, in this text at least there does seem to be little difference. Since in some sense it can be argued that the subject of the entire "Yogalehrbuch" is the *yogācāra*, as indeed the text has been read by D. S. Ruegg, it would be difficult to refer to passages of particular importance.<sup>90</sup> Ruegg in fact goes so far as to suggest that this text "virtually identifies the Yogācāra with the Bodhisattva ... when it remarks that at the end of his meditation the Yogācāra's *āśraya* becomes radiant with the Marks and Signs of the *mahāpuruṣa* ...; in fact the Yogācāra is destined one day to become a Bhagavat, a Samyaksambuddha, and a Guide of all living beings ...."<sup>91</sup> While it is obvious that the *yogācāra* here is a

89. Shastri 1971: 896–897: *atra samāsato 'śubhāyām vartamāno yogācāras trividhaḥ — ādikarmikāḥ kṛtaparijayaḥ atikrāntamanasikāras ca* | *tatra saṃkṣepacitta ādikarmiko yogācāra ekasmin pādāṅguṣṭhe mana upanibadhya pādāṅguṣṭham klidyamānaṃ paśyati* ["apeta]māṃsam [1] *evam yāvat sarvaṃ śarīram asthisāṅkalam adhimucyate* | *kṛtaparijayaḥ tu tathāiva yāvat kapālārddham* | *atikrāntamanasikāras tathāiva yāvat bhruvor madhye cittam dhārayati* | *vistaracittas tu āsamudrāsthivistārasaṃkṣepād ādikarmikāḥ ity evam-ādis trividha iti*.

90. See Schlingloff 1964. In the interests of space, I will not quote the text but merely the folio numbers on which the relevant passages begin. See the following: 127V6-R1; 128V4; 130R3; 131V6; 131R2; 136V2; 146V5; 152V6; 159V6, 160V5; and 165R1. In the following locations we find *yogācārāśraya*, but due to the fragmentary nature of the text the sense is unclear: 121R6, 123V6, 124R1, 128V2, 130V2, 131R1, 135R2, 139R3, 144R1. In addition, at 127V3 we find the compound *yogācārāpādatalaiḥ*. At 165V1 we have *yogācārasya*.

91. Ruegg 1967: 162. In fact, however, the passages to which Ruegg refers do not

meditator, I do not think we can obtain any clue as to whether he is a "professional," rather than simply anyone who happens to be involved in meditation. In any case, this text, if only as a representative of an important genre of "meditation manuals," provides interesting evidence for one use of the term.

Finally, we may note two interesting occurrences of the Sanskrit term in the relatively early *Saundarananda* of Aśvaghoṣa.<sup>92</sup> At XIV.19 we find the following:<sup>93</sup> "So the *yogācāra* gives food to his body only in order to suppress hunger, not out of lust [for food] or to show favor [to the body]." And again, in XV.68:<sup>94</sup> "Just as here in this world a smith melts in a fire gold, pure through progressive washings with water, separated from its impurities, and smelts it repeatedly, just so here in this world the skilled *yogācāra*, separated from his faults, purified of his defilements, calms and concentrates his mind." The *Saundarananda* is undoubtedly an important text for the study of Buddhist yoga, but at least explicitly the term or concept of the *yogācāra* does not seem to play a big role in the work as a whole.

Above I discussed the *Kāśyapaparivarta* and the *Ratnarāśi*, both Mahāyāna sūtras which belong to the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. Although there is reason to believe that these two and the other forty-seven texts in the same collection were grouped together at a relatively late date, and perhaps only in seventh century China, some of them also contain the term *yogācāra*, and it might be convenient to cite them together here. In a passage from the *Bhadramāyākāravāyākarana*, the term seems to refer generally to practitioners, without any specification of their practice:<sup>95</sup>

say exactly what he suggests they do, partly because they are fragmentary and the last (152V5), at least, largely a creation of the editor (according to the discussion of the meaning of round parentheses in the "Vorbemerkungen zum Text" in Schlingloff 1964: 58.)

92. The yoga in the *Saundarananda* has been extensively studied by Matsunami 1954.

93. Text from Johnston 1928. In addition, my translation is indebted to that of Johnston 1932. *yogācāras tathābhāram śarīrāya prayacchati* | *kevalam kṣudvighātārtham na rāgeṇa na bhaktaye* | I confess I do not understand well the force of *bhakti* here; my translation owes something to Prof. Schmithausen's suggestion.

94. *kramenādbhiḥ sūddham kanakam iba pāmsavyavahitaṃ yathāgnau karmāraḥ pacati bhr̥ṣam āvartayati ca* | *tathā yogācāro nīpunaṃ iba doṣavyavahitaṃ viśodhya kleṣebhyaḥ samayati manas saṃkṣipati ca* | La Vallée Poussin 1937: 190, note, remarks that the *yogācāra* here "achieves his purification after respiratory exercises," obviously referring to the preceding XV.64, which mentions *ānāpānasmṛti*.

95. Régamey 1938: §102: *bzang po bzhi po* | 'di dag ni byang chub sems pa rnams kyī

These four things, Bhadra, are the bodhisattva mahāsattva's generation of incorrect aspiration, which must be eliminated. What are the four? ...  
2) To not have faith (\**adhimukti*) in *yogācāra*s...

Here we have in some ways an exact contrast to the passage from the *Mahāvastu* we encountered above, in which one is warned away from the *yogācāra*. On the other hand, there is certainly no need for the two texts to agree in their respective attitudes toward the *yogācāra*.

In the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* we find a list of designations of monks. The Tibetan version lists the designations as: \**bahuśruta*, *dharmabhāṇaka*, *vinayadhara*, *mātrkādhara*, *bodhisattvapiṭakadhara*, *āraṇyaka*, *paiṇḍapātika*, *pāṃśukūlika*, *alpeccha*, *saṃtuṣṭa*, *pravivikta*, *yogācāra*, *dhyāyin*, *bodhisattvayānika*, *navakarmika*, *vaiyāprtyakara*, and *dpon sna byed pa*. We should note that *yogācāra* and *dhyāyin* are clearly distinguished, at least in the Tibetan version of this list,<sup>96</sup> but this of course does not mean that they point to mutually exclusive categories, as other items in the list suggest.<sup>97</sup> Another *Mahāratnakūṭa* text, the *Acintya-buddhaviṣayanirdeśa*, says: "Blessed One, the *yogācāra* who pursues emptiness separately from lust, hatred and delusion is one who does not practice (\**√car*) yoga; he is not a yogin. Why? Blessed One, emptiness is not to be sought separately from lust, hatred and delusion.

*tsbul bzhin ma yin pa'i sems skye ba zlog par bya ba yin te | bzhi gang zhe na | ... rnal 'byor spyod pa dag la ma mos pa | ....* (The text is from Régamey's edition, but the translation is my own.) The Chinese at T. 310 (XI) 490c9–10 has item 2 as 於所修行不生信受. I am not sure, but in T. 324 (XII) 35b8, item 3 seems to correspond: 於安隱無所造立. I say this not because I understand this expression, but only because I suspect that 安隱 is meant for \**yogakṣema*. If *adhimukti* is here at all, I cannot detect it, and by the same token I am puzzled by 所造立 (= \**abbhisamkṛta*?). (Prof. Schmithausen wonders whether 無所造立 might be meant for \**asaṃsthitatā*, pointing out that Pāli *santiṭṭhati* can be used in a sense close to *adhimukti*.)

96. The Tibetan is found at Peking *zhi* 317b5–7 = Derge *nga* 274a5–7 = sTog *ca* 28a7–b3, the Chinese at T. 310 (19) (XI) 477a1–4, T. 322 (XII) 19a28–b3, T. 323 (XII) 27a20–25, T. 1521 (XXVI) 63a2–8. A very helpful comparative list of the three Chinese translations of the sūtra, the quotation in the \**Daśabbhūmivibhāṣā*, and the Tibetan translation is found in Hirakawa 1990: 130–131. The text is translated in Nagao and Sakurabe 1974: 278. The Han dynasty translation of the sūtra has 思惟者和道行者, corresponding I suspect to the two terms *yogācāra* and *dhyāyin*, in reverse order, while Saṅghavarman has, respectively, 修行 and 坐禪. Dharmarakṣa and the \**Daśabbhūmivibhāṣā* both have only 坐禪者 in the place of the two terms.

97. That is, one might well, for example, be both *alpeccha* and *saṃtuṣṭa*. Therefore, to say that the Tibetan "clearly distinguishes" *yogācāra* and *dhyāyin* does not imply that they were necessarily thought of as mutually exclusive categories; I mean only that the *terms* are distinguished.

Blessed One, lust, hatred and delusion *are* emptiness."<sup>98</sup> In the *Akṣobhyatathāgatavyūha*, the term appears in a fairly nonspecific sense.<sup>99</sup>

Such references in Mahāyāna sūtras are not, of course, limited to the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. In both the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* and *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* we find the following in almost identical words:<sup>100</sup> "By way of example, Kauśika: When a *yogācāra* monk has arisen from meditative trance, since his mind is saturated with concentrated attention, he does not feel a strong attraction to food; his thoughts about food are few." Haribhadra, commenting on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, says:<sup>101</sup> "*yogācāra* means 'intent on the practice of (a) particular kind(s) of meditative trance.'" Here the Chinese translations of the sūtra are interesting: Lokakṣema renders *bhīqu*

98. Tibetan: sTog *ca* 442a5–7; Peking *zi* 283a7–b1; Derge *ca* 268b7–269a2: *bcom ldan 'das rnal 'byor spyod pa gang 'dod chags dang | zhe sdang dang | gti mug las gud du stong pa nyid tshol ba de ni rnal 'byor la mi spyod pa lags te | [P lags so | ] rnal 'byor ma lags [P legs] pa'o | de ci'i slad du zhe na | bcom ldan 'das 'dod chags dang | zhe sdang dang | gti mug las gud du stong pa nyid tshol bar bgyi ba ma mchis te | bcom ldan 'das 'dod chags dang | zhe sdang dang | gti mug nyid stong pa lags so | ].* Chinese is found at T. 310 (35) (XI) 566c17–20: 世尊、若觀行者離於煩惱而求性空、則不相應。云何別有性空異於煩惱。若觀煩惱即是性空、爲正修行。"Blessed One, if a practitioner (\**yogācāra*) seeks emptiness separately from the defilements, then this is not appropriate (\**na yujyate*?). How can there be emptiness distinct from the defilements? If one contemplates the defilements, [one finds that] they are nothing but emptiness; this is correct cultivation."

Following a suggestion of Jens-Uwe Hartmann, I have understood *rnal 'byor ma lags pa'o* to mean "he is not a yogin." However, the corresponding Chinese 不相應 seems to suggest that its translators took the Indic expression as something like \**na yujyate*.

99. sTog 11 (6), *dkon brisegs, kha*, 27b3, Peking 760 (6), *dzi* 21b6: *rnal 'byor spyod pa'i dge slong rdzu 'pbrul dang ldan pa*. The Chinese versions have T. 310 (6) (XI) 104b28 比丘諸神足, T. 313 (XI) 754c24 神通比丘, omitting \**yogācāra*. Dantinne 1983: 119 and 174, n. aw, completely ignores \**yogācāra* in the Tibetan. I owe the reference to this passage to the kindness of Jan Nattier.

100. *Aṣṭa* Mitra 92 = Wogihara 1932–1935: 262.15–17: *tad yathāpi nāma kauśika bhikṣor yogācārasya samādher vyutthitasya manasikārapariśyanditena cittena na balavatya āhāre grāddhir bhavati | mṛḍukā cāsyābhārasanijñā bhavati |*. *Pañcaviṃśati*: Kimura 1986: 86.26–28: *tad yathāpi nāma kauśika yogācārasya bhikṣoḥ samādher vyutthitasya manasikārasamārtarpitena cittena na balavatya āhāre grāddhir bhavati |*. We might recall here the idea referred to above in the *Ratnarāṣi*, namely that the bliss created by the Dhyānas serves as food for the meditator, so material nourishment is not necessary.

101. Wogihara 1932–1935: 263.7: *yogācārasyeti samādhivīṣeṣānuṣṭhānaparasya | samādhivīṣeṣa* may also mean "the most excellent meditative trance."

*dechan* 比丘得禪,<sup>102</sup> Zhi Qian has just *biqu* 比丘,<sup>103</sup> Kumārajīva has *zuochan biqu* 坐禪比丘,<sup>104</sup> Xuanzang renders *yugieshi rushengmiaoding* 瑜伽師入勝妙定,<sup>105</sup> \*Mokṣala offers *xixing biqu* 習行比丘,<sup>106</sup> and \*Dānapāla has *xiu xiangyingxing pichu* 修相應行苾芻.<sup>107</sup> While Lokakṣema renders "a monk who has attained concentration," Zhi Qian has avoided the issue altogether, rendering merely "monk." Kumārajīva offers what in some contexts at least, such as that of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya,<sup>108</sup> seems to be the standard rendering, "meditating/meditation monk," while Xuanzang has also given what is his usual (though apparently not invariant) equivalent. \*Mokṣala has merely "the monk who cultivates practice," while the latest, Song dynasty, translation of \*Dānapāla has gone the farthest, rendering "the monk who cultivates yogic practice." The Chinese translations of the two sūtras (or two versions of the same sūtra?) generally agree well.

The renderings of Kumārajīva are also, like those of Xuanzang, not always consistent. In the Sanskrit *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka* we find the following:<sup>109</sup> "Those monks and nuns, male and female lay disciples,

102. T. 224 (VIII) 435b22 = T. 226 (VIII) 517b9.

103. T. 225 (VIII) 485b4.

104. T. 227 (VIII) 545a15–16, and T. 223 (VIII) 290a15–16. Actually the latter reads 比丘坐禪, which seems to be a misprint or miscopy. It is hard to imagine what could be intended here by 比丘坐禪, while 坐禪比丘 would be easily understandable.

105. T. 220 (2) (VII) 161b1–2 = T. 220 (4) (VII) 781a20 = T. 220 (5) (VII) 877b14. Compare also Xuanzang's T. 220 (VII) 1016c20–22.

106. T. 221 (VIII) 51a22.

107. T. 228 (VIII) 601b18–19.

108. It is possible that the translators of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, who worked shortly after the time of Kumārajīva, adopted the rendering selected by him. I do not know if there are any studies of the translation equivalents in the Chinese Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, and whether on the whole these equivalents agree with the terminology found in the works of Kumārajīva.

109. Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912: 6.11–12: *ye ca teṣu buddhakṣetreṣu bhikṣubhikṣuṇy-upāsakopāsikā yogino yogācārāḥ prāptaphalāś cāprāptaphalāś ca te 'pi sarve samāśṛyate sma*. (Kashgar and Gilgit are identical.) Tibetan (Peking 4b1–2): *sangs rgyas kyi zhing de dag na dge slong dang dge slong ma dang| dge snyen dang| dge bsnyen ma dang| rnal 'byor can dang| rnal 'byor spyod pa gang dag 'bras bu thob pa dang| 'bras bu ma thob pa de dag thams cad kyang smang ngo||*. The syntax of the Sanskrit has been understood strangely in Matsunami et al. 1975: 12: それらの仏陀の国土には比丘・比丘尼、信男・信女の修行者たちがいて、瑜伽行を修め、その結果を得たものもあれば、まだ得ないものもあるが、彼らもまたすべて見えた。I frankly think this cannot be correct. Note that the Tibetan translation does not support this rendering. Compare the translations in Burnouf 1852: 4, and Kern 1884: 7.

*yogins* and *yogācāras*, who had attained the fruit and who had not attained the fruit, also all appeared in those buddha fields." The Chinese translation of Kumārajīva has, corresponding to *yogino yogācārāḥ prāptaphalāś cāprāptaphalāś ca*, 諸修行得道者.<sup>110</sup> It is at least possible that this should be understood as more or less equivalent to *yogācārāḥ* and *prāptaphalāḥ*, although a recent English rendering has more naturally understood the Chinese phrase as one (apparently causal) expression: "those who had practised and achieved the path."<sup>111</sup>

The *Ratnamegha*, a very interesting text, actually makes some attempt to, as it were, "define" the term *yogācāra* (although of course one should not confuse this type of listing with true definition).<sup>112</sup>

If, gentle son, bodhisattvas possess ten qualities they are *yogācāras*. What are the ten? [They are] (1) Amply cultivating [the contemplation on] the disgusting (\**uṣubhabhāvanā*). (2) Amply cultivating [the contemplation on] friendliness (\**maitrī*). (3) Amply cultivating [the contemplation on] dependent arisal (\**pratītyasamutpāda*). (4) Being amply expert concerning faults.<sup>113</sup> (5) Amply cultivating [the contemplation on] emptiness (\**śūnyatā*). (6) Amply cultivating [the contemplation on] the signless

The identical expression in the Sanskrit text of the *Karuṇapūṇḍarīka* (Yamada 1968: II.5.2–21) is due to the fact that, the beginning of the Sanskrit original having been lost at some point, the *Karuṇapūṇḍarīka* manuscripts were supplanted from the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka* (Yamada 1968: I.22).

110. T. 262 (IX) 2b21. Exactly the same is found at T. 264 (IX) 135b28.

111. Kubo and Yuyama 1991: 3. It is also so understood by Watson 1993: 6: "who had carried out religious practices and attained the way." This is also a traditional Japanese reading (Nakada 1989: 14): もろもろの修行し得道するもの.

Dharmarakṣa's version, T. 263 (IX) 63c12–13, has: 修行獨處者逮得德果一切表露. Here *yogin* and *yogācāra* seem to have been understood as 修行獨處者, a translation which we might have understood otherwise as equivalent to \**yogācāra* and \**āraṇyaka* (?).

It is worth remarking that, the syntax notwithstanding, it is unlikely that the text means to imply that male or female lay disciples might be *yogācāras*.

112. Derge Kanjur 231, mdo sde, wa, 90a6-b1: *rigs kyi bu chos bcu dang ldan na byang chub sems dpa' rnal 'byor spyod pa rnams yin no|| bcu gang zhe na| 'di lta ste|* (1) *mi sdug pa bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin|* (2) *byams pa bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin|* (3) *rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin|* (4) *skyon la mkhas pa mang ba rnams yin|* (5) *stong pa nyid bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin|* (6) *mtshan ma med pa bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin|* (7) *rnal 'byor bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin|* (8) *rgyun tu bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin|* (9) *'gyod pa med pa rnams yin|* (10) *tshul khrims phun sum tshogs pa rnams yin|*. The Chinese versions of this passage are found as follows: T. 489 (XIV) 740b22–28, T. 658 (XVI) 232c28–233a2, T. 659 (XVI) 269b1–6, T. 660 (XVI) 318b23–29.

113. The sense is not entirely clear to me. Two of the Chinese versions seem to suggest "completely eliminating all faults and transgressions," T. 489 於諸過患善能

(\*animitta°). (7) Amply cultivating [the contemplation on] yogic practice (\*yoga°). (8) Amply engaging in continual cultivation. (9) Being without remorse (\*kaukrtya). (10) And completely upholding the precepts.

Here there can be no question that it is the meditative cultivation of the *yogācāra* which is felt to define him, although we should not overlook the mention in item (10) of the precepts.

The *Brahmaṇiṣeṣacintiparipṛcchā* contains a reference to the *yogācāra* in a widely quoted passage:<sup>114</sup>

Those deluded people, Blessed One, who having renounced the world into the well-known community are fallen into the speculative views of the heretics and seek nirvāṇa as a real existent—just as [people seek to

除斷 and T. 658 多修離過患法; another two support “expert,” T. 659 善識汚心之法 and T. 660 於諸過患常修善巧.

114. In his edition of the first *bam po* of the sūtra, Goshima Kiyotaka has traced multiple quotations of the passage. In this unfortunately not very accessible edition, Goshima 1981: 31–32, and appendix pages 9–13, the passage is critically edited on the basis of a number of sources. For reference see the Derge Kanjur 160, *ba*, 33b, and Peking 827, *phu*, 34b4, and in Chinese T. 585 (XV) 4c7–13; T. 586 (XV) 36c28–37a4; T. 587 (XV) 66c16–21. The Sanskrit for the passage is available in the *Prasannapadā* of Candrakīrti, although quoted there under the odd name *Tathāgataṅgubhyaparivarta* = *de bzbin gshegs pa'i gsang ba bstan pa'i le'u*. (No such name appears in the list of alternative titles found at the end of the sūtra itself.) See La Vallée Poussin 1903–1913: 540.12–541.5: *tad ime bhagavan mohapuruṣā ye svākhyāte dharmavinaye pravrajya tīrthikadr̥ṣṭau nipatitā nirvāṇam bhāvataḥ paryeṣate tadyathā tilebhyas tailam kṣīrāt sarpiḥ | atyantaparinirvṛteṣu bhagavan sarvadbarmeṣu te nirvāṇam mārganti tān aham ābhīmānikān tīrthikān iti vadāmi | na bhagavan yogācārāḥ samyakpratipannāḥ kasyacid dharmasyotpādān vā nirodham vā karoti nāpi kasyacid dharmasya prāptim icchati nābbisamayam iti vistaraḥ |* The Tibetan translation of this passage is found in the Derge Tanjur 3860, *dbu ma*, 'u, 182a1–5. According to Goshima's edition, the passage is also found in the *Prajñāpradīpa* of Bhāvaviveka, Peking Tanjur, *dbu ma*, *tsba*, 311b7–312a5, Chinese T. 1566 (XXX) 131b2–8, and in Avalokitavṛata's *ṭīkā*: Peking, *dbu ma*, *za*, 360b7–361a5. In all cases the Tibetan versions of the sūtra and its quotations in the śāstras have *yogācāra samyakpratipanna* as *rnal 'byor spyod pa yang dag par zhus pa*. The Chinese versions, however, show a considerable variation: T. 585 修行者; T. 586 and T. 587 正修道者; and *Prajñāpradīpa* 成就行者. Although not mentioned by Goshima, the final portion of the quotation is also found in the 瑜伽師地論釋 T. 1580 (XXX) 884a3–6, and there the term is rendered with Xuanzang's (nearly) habitual 瑜伽師. The Tibetan equivalent of this text is the \**Yogācār(y)abhūmivyākhyā*, Tōh. 4043 (Derge Tanjur, *sems tsam*, 'i, 69b4), in which we read: *tshangs pas zhus pa chen po'i mdo las kyang | bcom ldan 'das rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa la yang dag par zhus pa ni chos gang skye ba'am 'gag par mi bgyid do zhes bya ba la sogs pa gsungs so |* The rendering *rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa* suggests, however, an understanding of \**yogācārabbūmi*. Does this imply that we should imagine something like \**yogācārabbūmau samyakpratipanna*, i.e., “one who is perfected in his practice in the stage of the practice of yoga”? (On the relation between Tōh. 4043 and T. 1580, see Mukai 1979: 42, and 61, n. 10.)

obtain real] oil from [real] sesame seeds, [real] ghee from [real] milk—are seeking, Blessed One, after nirvāṇa among all things which are already completely passed into nirvāṇa.<sup>115</sup> I call those people misguided heretics. The *yogācāra*, Blessed One, who is correctly perfected in his practice does not cause the arising or destruction of anything at all, nor does he wish for the acquisition of anything, nor its realization.

Here the authors of the sūtra use the term *yogācāra* to refer to the type of practitioner of whose behavior and views they approve; he is in fact a sort of touchstone of orthodoxy against which the heterodox are to be contrasted. If we are to so understand the *yogācāras* as those practitioners whose views are correct, in contrast to the deluded, then it seems to be implied that they too are monks, those who have “renounced the world into the well-known community.” It is interesting here too to note that this passage clearly refers to orthodoxy, not orthopraxy, as one might expect if the defining characteristic of the *yogācāra* were his practice itself.

Hints that the *yogācāra* may be more than a mere monk appear in several places. The *Ratnamegha* contains the following passage:<sup>116</sup> “Gentle son, if people are endowed with ten qualities they are noble bodhisattvas (\**ājāneyabodhisattva*). ... 1) [If they] are *yogācāras* who abundantly contemplate emptiness....” In the *Gaṇḍavyūha* we find the expression:<sup>117</sup> “[The Tathāgata's body] makes fall for the *yogācāra*

115. It is possible we should read this, as Jens-Uwe Hartmann has suggested to me, as a locative absolute: “when all things are already completely passed into nirvāṇa.” The point is that it is a mistake to regard such things as real, and seek to obtain from them something real.

116. The passage in Tibetan reads (Derge Kanjur 231, *mdo sde*, *wa* 58a4): *rigs kyi bu chos bcu dang ldan na byan chub sems dpa' cang shes pa rnams yin no | | bcu gang zhe na | 'di lta ste |* (1) *stong pa nyid la sgom pa mang bas rnal 'byor spyod pa rnams yin |* The Chinese translations render the crucial expression: T. 660 (XVI) 305c4 得瑜伽師; T. 489 (XIV) 726c12–13: 雖修定行而常觀空; T. 659 (XVI) 257a6–7: 坐禪攝心; T. 658 (XVI) 222b18: 雖行禪定恒修空相.

117. Suzuki and Idzumi 1949: 94.13–14: *yogācārāṇām bodhisattvāṇām sarvadharmasvabhāvatānirghoṣaṇ nāma dharmameghavarṣaṇ abhipravṛṣamāṇān*. The Chinese versions have the critical term as T. 278 (IX) 696c18: 修行菩薩; T. 279 (X) 342a4: 修行位諸菩薩; T. 293 (X) 691c7–8: 修行相應位諸菩薩. They do not offer much help, however, with the word *tala*. The translation of Kajiyama et al. 1994: I.166 has avoided the problem of interpreting the difficult compound by merely quoting the Chinese rendering of T. 293. Takasaki 1974: 554, n. 54 suggested that the list in which the item quoted here appears is presented in descending order of importance, namely: *bodhimāṇḍavaragata bodhisattva*, *abhiṣekapṛāpta b°*, *mahādharmayauvarājyābbhēka b°*, *kumārabhūta b°*, *avivartya b°*, *suddhābhyaśaya b°*, *pūrvayogasampanna b°*, *janmaja b°*, *yogācāra b°*, *ādikarmika b°*, *prathamacittotpādika b°*, etc. The same list

bodhisattvas rain from the cloud of the teaching which is called the cry of the base (?) of the intrinsic nature of all things." I confess that this remains rather unclear to me, but taken together with the *Ratnamegha* passage it is interesting that both point explicitly to the *yogācāra* as a bodhisattva. As noted above, Ruegg pointed out that the "Yoga-lehrbuch" seems to take a similar view of the *yogācāra* as a bodhisattva.

Another important, although quite obviously not early, Mahāyāna sūtra, the *Laṅkāvatāra*, has the following passage:<sup>118</sup>

appears in several other texts, there limited to ten members, however. (See Yamada 1959: 256–57.) See for example T. 1487 (XXIV) 1033a26–b4, where *yogācāra* is transcribed 喻阿闍, and the almost identical text at T. 283 (X) 454c4, 455a11–18, where the term is 喻阿闍, and ten qualities of the *yogācāra* are listed.

118. Nanjio 1923: 248.8–14: *śmaśānikānām ca mahāmate arāṇyavanaprasthāny amanuṣyāvacarāṇi prāntāni śayanāsanāny adhyāvasatām yoginām yogācārāṇām maitrīvihārīṇām vidyādhārāṇām vidyāsādhayitukāmānām vidyāsādhanamokṣaviḥṇakaratvān mahāyānasamprasthitānām kulaputrāṇām kuladubhitṛṇām ca sarvayogasādhanāntarāyakaram ity api samanupaśyatām (?) mahāmate svaparātmahitakāmasya māṁsam sarvam abhakṣyam bodhisattvasya.*

The Tibetan text in the Derge Kanjur 107, *mdo sde, ca*, 154a6–b1, reads: *blo gros chen po dur khrod pa rnam dang | dgon pa nags 'dab mi ma yin pa rgyu ba bas mtha'i mal stan la gnas pa'i rnal 'byor pa | rnal 'byor la spyod pa byams pa la gnas pa rnam dang | rig sngags 'chang ba | rig sngags grub par 'dod pa rnam kyi rig sngags sgrub pa dang | thar pa la bgegs byed pa'i phyir theg pa chen po la zhus pa'i rigs kyi bu dang | rigs kyi bu mo rnam kyi rnal 'byor sgrub pa thams cad kyi bar chad byed par 'gyur bar rjes su mibong nas bdag dang gzhan gyi lus la phan par 'dod pa'i byang chub sems dpas sha thams cad mi bza'o ||.*

My translation of the Sanskrit is guided by my understanding of the Tibetan translation. This is especially so with regard to the insertion of conjunctions; the Sanskrit appears to intend several classes, cemetery dwellers, yogins, upholders of spells, etc., in apposition, while the Tibetan translation conjoins them. I follow the latter understanding. The Chinese translation T. 672 (XVI) 623b27–c2 appears to have an equivalent for *yogācāra* with 寂靜修行, but the equivalence is problematic. I am very grateful to Prof. Schmithausen for his remarks on this and the following *Laṅkāvatāra* passage, and to Prof. Nagao for his suggestion on the first quotation. Prof. Nagao, in fact, would translate this passage as follows:

And moreover, Mahāmati, because for those who dwell in cemeteries, and for those yogins and *yogācāras*, who dwell in wilderness areas, realms frequented by demons, and border regions, and who dwell in friendliness, and for those upholders of spells, who wish to completely command spells, it (meat eating) creates an obstacle to the perfection of spells and to liberation,—and also for those gentle sons and gentle daughters who, observing that this causes obstruction to all the perfections of yoga, just set out in the Mahāyāna, (the same is true)—Mahāmati, the bodhisattva who desires his own and others' benefit should not eat any meat at all.

I confess that despite the assistance of these two great scholars I still cannot clearly construe the construction of the whole passage. (Prof. Schmithausen suggests

And moreover, Mahāmati, because [meat eating] creates an obstacle to the perfection of spells and to liberation for those who dwell in cemeteries, and for yogins, *yogācāras*, who dwell in wilderness areas, realms frequented by demons, and border regions, who dwell in friendliness, and for the upholders of spells, those who wish to completely command spells, and observing that this causes obstruction to all the perfections of yoga for those gentle sons and gentle daughters just set out in the Mahāyāna, Mahāmati, the bodhisattva who desires his own and others' benefit should not eat any meat at all.

Here again *yogācāra* seems to be virtually synonymous with *yogin*, and may or may not be considered as an avocation parallel to dwelling in cemeteries or dwelling in wilderness areas.<sup>119</sup> I think we have virtually the same implications a bit later in the same sūtra:<sup>120</sup>

that *vidyādhārāṇām vidyāsādhayitukāmānām vidyāsādhanamokṣaviḥṇakaratvān* may be an intrusion, pointing to *Hastikakṣyasūtra* T. 814 [XVII] 787a11, Peking 873, *mdo, tsu*, 115a3.)

119. One of the many powers of a *dhāraṇī* described in the *Sūryagarbhasūtra* is that it makes the *yogācāra* delight in wilderness dwelling. At least this is the understanding of the Chinese text: T. 397 (XIII) 250b12 令坐禪人樂阿蘭若, 258b22 能令坐禪人樂阿蘭若, and 264a17 坐禪行人樂阿蘭若. The Tibetan, however, reads somewhat differently (Derge Kanjur 257, *mdo sde, za*, 137b7, 158a3, and 172a3): *rnal 'byor spyod pa rnam mngon par dga' bar bgyi ba* (or: *byed pa*['o]). Should we emend *mngon par* to *\*dgon par*? (In the first place, of course, the reading of these passages in other Kanjurs must be confirmed; I regret that at the moment I lack access to any Kanjur other than the Derge.)

120. Nanjio 1923: 254.8–16: *yadi tu mahāmate anujñātukāmatā me syāt kalpyam vā me śrāvakāṇām pratisevitum syāt nāham maitrīvihārīṇām yoginām yogācārāṇām śmaśānikānām mahāyānasamprasthitānām kulaputrāṇām kuladubhitṛṇām ca sarvasattvaikaputrakasamjñābhāvanārtham sarvamāṁsabbakṣaṇapratiseḍham kuryām | kṛtavāṁs cāsmi* <Edition: *kuryām kṛtavāṁs ca asmin*> *mahāmate dharmakāmānām kulaputrāṇām kuladubhitṛṇām ca sarvayānasamprasthitānām śmaśānikānām maitrīvihārīṇām āraṇyakāṇām yoginām yogācārāṇām sarvayogasādhanāya sarvasattvaikaputrakasamjñābhāvanārtham sarvamāṁsapratiseḍham.*

The Tibetan text in the Derge Kanjur 107, *mdo sde, ca*, 156a6–b2, reads: *blo gros chen po gal te ngas gñang bar bya bar 'dod dam | nga'i nyan thos rnam kyi bsnyen par rung ba zbig yin na ni | byams pas gnas pa'i rnal 'byor can dur khrod pa rnam dang | theg pa chen po la yang dag par zhus pa'i rigs kyi bu dang | rigs kyi bu mo rnam la sems can thams cad bu gcig bzbin du 'du shes bsgom pa'i phyir sha thams cad za ba gcod par yang byas so || blo gros chen po ngas ni rigs kyi bu dang rigs kyi bu mo chos 'dod pa theg pa thams cad la rab tu zhus pa rnam dang | dur khrod pa byams pa la gnas pa dgon pa pa rnal 'byor la spyod pa rnam kyi rnal 'byor thams cad sgrub pa dang sems can thams cad bu bzbin du 'du shes bsgom pa'i phyir | sha thams cad gcod par yang byas so ||.* \*Something is very odd here in the Derge text: a negation seems to be missing from the final verb in this sentence. I regret I have not been able to check other editions, but Prof. Schmithausen informs me it is missing in the Peking edition too.

My translation of the Sanskrit was guided by the Tibetan translation and Prof.



But if, Mahāmati, I had wanted to allow [meat-eating], or if I were to judge it as acceptable for my auditors to indulge in [meat eating], then I would not make the prohibition of all meat-eating, in order for yogis, *yogācāras*, who dwell in friendliness, who dwell in cemeteries, and<sup>121</sup> for gentle sons and gentle daughters who are set out in the Great Vehicle, to cultivate the idea that all beings are like their only child. But, Mahāmati, I have [in fact] made the prohibition on all meat, so that gentle sons and gentle daughters who desire the teachings, who are set out in any vehicle, who dwell in cemeteries, who dwell in friendliness, who dwell in wilderness areas, who are *yogins*<sup>122</sup> and *yogācāras*, might cultivate the idea that all beings are like their only child so that they may perfect all the yogas.<sup>123</sup>

Finally, in the *Sarvādhinirmocana*, also of unknown date but certainly not early, the term seems to be used, as we have seen it before, in a quite nonspecific sense.<sup>124</sup>

Again, Subhūti, the *yogācāra* monk, understanding the true nature of one skandha as the ultimate selflessness of dharmas, does not seek out individually the ultimate characterization of absence of self of other skandhas, dhātus, āyatanas, dependent arisal, nourishments, truths, foundations of mindfulness, exertions, bases of magical power, powers, strengths, limbs of awakening, and the eight-fold noble path. Rather, relying on the non-dual knowledge which conforms to true reality, he ascertains and correctly understands the characteristic of the same flavor

Schmithausen's comments; the emendation is also his. Equivalents in the Chinese translations are found at T. 671 (XVI) 563c4–12, with 如實行者, and T. 672 (XVI) 624a22–26 with 修觀行者. On terminology close to 如實行者, and its relation to *yoga/yogin*, see Takasaki 1993.

121. The conjunction is indicated by Tibetan, but absent in Sanskrit, which appears to be appositional.

122. Tibetan omits *yogins*.

123. Tibetan has: "so that they might cultivate the perfection of all yogas and the idea that all beings are like their only child." This seems to give a somewhat better sense.

124. Lamotte 1935: IV.9: *rab 'byor gzhan yang dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa ni phung po gcig gi de bzhi nyid don dam pa'i chos bdag med pa rab tu rtogs nas yang de las gzhan pa'i phung po rnam dang | kham rnam dang | skyed mched rnam dang | rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang | zas rnam dang | bden pa rnam dang | dran pa nye bar bzhag pa rnam dang | yang dag par spong ba rnam dang | rdzu 'phrul gyi rkang pa rnam dang | dbang po rnam dang | stobs rnam dang | byang chub kyi yan lag rnam so so dang | 'phags pa'i lam yan lag brgyad pa so so la de bzhi nyid don dam pa bdag med pa yongs su tshol bar mi byed kyi de bzhi nyid kyi rjes su 'brang ba gnyis med pa'i shes pa la rten pa de nyid kyi don dam pa thams cad du ro gcig pa'i mtshan nyid nges par 'dzin pa dang | mngon par rtogs pa kho nar byed de | rab 'byor rnam grangs des kyang khyod kyi 'di ltar thams cad du ro gcig pa'i mtshan nyid gang yin pa de don dam pa yin par rig par bya'o |*. The Chinese versions are found at T. 675 (XVI) 668c11–16, and T. 677 (XVI) 714b1–10. Both render *\*yogācāra bhikṣu* with 修行比丘.

in all ultimate truth. Through this teaching, Subhūti, you must understand that what is characterized by the same flavor in everything is the ultimate truth.

As mentioned above, the term does not seem to have received quite the attention in the śāstric literature one might have expected. In the *Yogācārabhūmi* of Saṅgharakṣa, in genre somewhat similar to the "Yogalehrbuch" published by Schlingloff, both *yogācāra* and *yogācārabhūmi* are defined. However, the definitions are not entirely clear. We possess two versions of the text in Chinese, one by Dharmarakṣa, and the other (partial) version by An Shigao. The former at least seems to understand *yogācāra* as a *tatpuruṣa*,<sup>125</sup> "practicing what is to be cultivated and following it." Unfortunately the following definition of *yogācārabhūmi* is not entirely clear.<sup>126</sup> This is not a *Yogācāra* text. However, the term *yogācāra* does appear in the works of the *Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda* school proper, although apparently again (and surprisingly?) without special emphasis.<sup>127</sup> In the portion of the *Śrāvakabhūmi* published by Wayman, for instance, we find the word several times. In the fourth *Yogasthāna* the term *yogācāra* seems to be used synonymously with *yogin*, and the specification *ādikarmika yogācāra*, which we saw above in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, is found.<sup>128</sup> The fact that this term refers to one involved in mental, meditative cultivation is made clear in a subsequent passage.<sup>129</sup> The word appears also in other *Śrāvakabhūmi* materials studied by Sakuma, also fortunately preserved in Sanskrit.<sup>130</sup> Especially important is a lengthy quotation

125. T. 606 (XV) 182b29–c1, with variant 16. The version of An Shigao T. 607 (XV) 231b3 is not helpful in this regard. See Demiéville 1954: 398.

126. T. 606 (XV) 182c1–2, T. 607 (XV) 231b5–6; see Demiéville 1954: 398, and 343.

127. The term seems to be likewise rare in Madhyamaka texts. For example, despite its title (the precise meaning of which is not clear to me), the *Bodhisattvayogācāracaṭuṣṭakāṭikā*, Candrakīrti's commentary to Āryadeva's *Caṭuṣṭaka*, appears, according to Suzuki's index (1994b: 265, s.v. *yogācāra*) to use the term only once (Suzuki 1994a: 154.9 [ad VIII.24]), and then in a rather generic way. It is interesting that the Tibetan translation here renders *yogācāra* with *rnal 'byor pa* (but this Tibetan version differs from the extant Sanskrit on many points).

128. Wayman 1961: 125, and see also Shukla 1973: 437. This expression also occurs in Pāli in the form *ādikammiko yogāvacaro*, on which see Silk 1997, n. 26.

129. Wayman 1961: 130, and see also Shukla 1973: 470.

130. I refer to the critical edition of Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese (with German translation) in Sakuma 1990. For the Sanskrit see also the edition princeps of Shukla 1973: 197–200. The passage below was already noticed (in Chinese) by Miyamoto 1932: 772.

from what might be an as yet unidentified sūtra source.<sup>131</sup> I refer to this material in the context of śāstric rather than sūtra sources because I am not certain that the "quotation" has a genuine source older than the śāstra.<sup>132</sup> In any case, the term here is juxtaposed with *bhikṣu* and *yogin* in one set expression, *bhikṣur yogī yogācārah*.<sup>133</sup> It is clear from the context that the monk who is a *yogin* and *yogācāra*<sup>134</sup> is considered to be one engaged in meditative cultivation. The apparent quotation begins:<sup>135</sup>

131. See Sakuma 1990: i.16. He refers there to Shukla 1973: 197, n. 1.

132. That is, we might keep in mind the possibility that the author(s) or compiler(s) of the *Yogācārabhūmi* may have made up the sūtra reference him- or them-selves as a way of legitimating his or their ideas. (Note that there is actually no reference to a sūtra in Sanskrit, Tibetan, or Chinese. The Sanskrit begins: *yathoktaṁ bhagavatā āyusmantarī revatam ārabhya*. The implication, however, is that the following was spoken in a sūtra.) In regard to the source of the quotation, although the case is obviously quite different and the evidence as yet weak, we might recall Nagao's discussion concerning the *Abhidharma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, quoted often in the works of Asaṅga. Nagao 1982: 28–33 considers in detail the facts concerning this *Abhidharma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, concluding (p. 33) in a cautious manner, but clearly implying that the author of the "quoted" passages may well have been Asaṅga himself. Notice that our "sūtra quotation" has been studied from an entirely different point of view by Schmithausen 1976: 239–242. Schmithausen does not mention any doubts about the authenticity of the source, merely referring to it as "an unknown Sūtra." Davidson 1985 seems to assume that what he calls the *Revatasūtra* is a legitimately old work, since he cites it together with the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* and the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. And on p. 131 he makes his assumption explicit by calling it "probably the oldest sūtra base for the doctrine of *āśraya-parivṛtti* under the guise of *āśraya-viśuddhi*." At 194, n. 9, he says "The actual title of this sūtra is unknown, but Revata as a figure and the material in this sūtra appear to have been specific sectarian developments within the Kashmir-Gandhāra area." I have pointed out above that Revata is important in canonical sources as the first among those dedicated to *dhyāna*.

133. I am not certain that this form is invariant, however, and wonder whether we must agree with Sakuma 1990: ii.9 n. 43 (§A.2.1) who restores *yogī*, missing in the Sanskrit manuscript and Tibetan translation. He suggests that it is found in the Chinese translation, which has 比丘勤修觀行是瑜伽師, its habitual translation of the complete set *bhikṣur yogī yogācārah*. In other nearby passages, *yogin* alone is indeed regularly rendered 修觀行者. While it is therefore likely that the Chinese text does in fact represent the whole phrase, the entire question is a relatively minor one, and especially in view of this, given the agreement of the Tibetan translation with the Sanskrit text, I would prefer not to emend the latter solely on the basis of the Chinese.

134. Tibetan supports the understanding of the expression as an appositional phrase, so perhaps even better: "a *yogin*, a *yogācāra*."

135. Sakuma 1990: ii.9–10 (§A.2.1–2): *kiyatā bhadanta bhikṣur yogācāra ālambane cittam upanibadhnāti | katamasminn ālambane cittam upanibadhnāti | katham punar ālambane*

In how many ways, Reverend, does a monk who is a *yogācāra* fix his mind on an object? On what object does he fix his mind? And how is his mind fixed on its object that it comes to be firmly fixed? ... Now, Revata, a monk who is a *yogin* and *yogācāra* and wants to purify his practice, or wants to produce expertise [in the skandhas, and so on], or wants to free his mind from the depravities, fixes his mind on a suitable object, and fixes it exactly correctly on a corresponding [object], and he is an assiduous meditator devoted to that [object].

It is clear from this passage and the passages that follow it that the *yogācāra* monk, who is considered simultaneously to be a *yogin*, is here a meditator. This is quite in concert with what other sources suggest.<sup>136</sup>

I noted at the outset that I did not initially see any serious problem in finding an appropriate translation for *yogācāra*, thinking one would not go far wrong with "practitioner of yoga." But this actually begs several questions. What we really need to understand is the specific reference or references of the term. Is the *yogācāra* a meditator or a meditation specialist? Or again, is he (or she) merely a generic "practitioner"? What does "yoga" signify here? Does it signify the same thing in every text in which the term appears? Our survey above seems to suggest that, in the majority of cases, the reference of *yogācāra* does not in fact seem to be specific at all. On the contrary, it is rather generic. Certainly in most cases the *yogācāra* or *yogācāra bhikṣu* seems to be a meditative practitioner, although there are several

*cittam upanibaddham sūpanibaddham bhavati | ... iha Revata bhikṣur yogī yogācārah caritaṁ vā viśodhayitukāmaḥ kausalyaṁ vā kartukāmaḥ āsravebhya vā cittam vimocayitukāmaḥ anurūpe cālambane cittam upanibadhnāti pratirūpe ca samyag eva copanibadhnāti tatra cānirākṛtadhyāyī bhavati*. The corresponding Tibetan text is found on pages 43–44 (Derge 4036, 77a1ff.; Peking 5537, 92b5ff.), Chinese on 79–80 (T. 1579 [XXX] 427c27ff.). Sakuma offers the following translation (pages 105–106): "Auf wieviele [Weisen] (oder: Aufgrund von wieviel[en Motiven(?)]) fixiert der Yoga-Praxis übende Mönch seinen Geist auf den [Übungs]gegenstand? Auf welchen [Übungs]gegenstand fixiert er seinen Geist? Wie, ferner (oder: anderseits), muss der Geist auf den [Übungs]gegenstand fixiert [sein, um] gut fixiert [zu sein]? ... Wenn da ein Mönch, der ein Yogin ist, der die Yoga-Praxis übt, sein Verhalten läutern, Versiertheit erwerben oder seinen Geist von den "üblen Einflüssen" befreien will, so fixiert er seinen Geist auf den (jeweils) angemessenen [Übungs]gegenstand, auf einen entsprechenden (ähnlichen) [Gegenstand], [fixiert ihn] in genau der richtigen Weise, und ist unermüdlich der darauf [gerichteten] versenkungsmäßigen Betrachtung gewidmet."

136. A further reference from what is perhaps a sūtra commentary is worth mentioning. Waldschmidt 1965: 294 (SHT 649 R3–4) has: *evam yogī yogācārah pañcaskandhām dubhān iti paśya[tī]*. Nothing further in the manuscript fragment clarifies what is meant by *yogācāra* here, but its conjunction with *yogin* does not seem unusual.

cases in which even meditation seems not necessarily to be involved. If we are to understand the Chinese renderings at their face value, they often suggest that *yogācāra* refers to the practice of seated meditation ("zazen"), but even this term does not imply anything specific about the actual mental content of the practice. By the same token there is also a considerable number of cases in which the term has been rendered into Chinese with a generic term seeming to indicate nothing more precise than what we might mean in contemporary English by "practitioner."

When we can tell (and usually there is no indication), the term *yogācāra* does not seem to be used to distinguish advanced from beginning practitioners; some of our sources (and there may be interesting commonalities between diverse sources in this regard) are in fact quite explicit about the application of the term to one at *any* stage of the path. Likewise, the specific doctrinal content or orientation of the meditation undertaken by the *yogācāra* (when indeed meditation comes into the question) does not seem to be specified; the term seems to be widely used with reference to different varieties of meditative practice, or even more usually with reference to meditative practice generically understood. This supports the observation that the label may be applied equally to beginning and advanced practitioners. It has not been possible to determine with certainty whether the term points more to a vocation or career than an avocation—in other words, whether the *yogācāra* is a professional meditator, or rather more simply a monk who happens to be engaged in meditative practice (however this is understood) at a given time. But certainly the generic usages documented above argue forcefully against the strong reading of "meditation monk" in the sense of one who devotes himself especially to meditative cultivation as a vocation. This also raises the question of the importance of the term *bhikṣu* here. Indeed, while we do frequently find the collocation *yogācāra bhikṣu*, we also find *yogācāra* alone, and there are even some indications that a *yogācāra* need not necessarily be a monk (or nun). On the other hand, there is no indication that the term *yogācāra bhikṣu* need indicate anything more specific or precise than does *yogācāra* alone.

The frequent coordination of *yogācāra* with *yogin* suggests that the two terms are, at least sometimes, if not usually, thought to be near or virtual synonyms.<sup>137</sup> If this be the case, we might suppose *yogācāra*

137. Although this is only corollary evidence at best, it is interesting to note that it appears that Uigur translators of Tibetan texts often, even systematically, rendered

to be the more restricted term, since it appears to be found, in this sense (rather than as a *tatpuruṣa* meaning "the practice of yoga"), only in Buddhist literature, whereas *yogin* is, of course, a common term in almost all genres of Sanskrit literature.

The appearance of the term *yogācāra* in vinaya literature might suggest a relatively early origin for the term. (We should remember, however, that we have little solid information upon which to base *any* absolute chronology of Indian Buddhist literature, and without further specification a word like "early" is not terribly meaningful, and even potentially misleading.) We cannot say, since we are so poorly supplied with Buddhist texts in Indic languages, whether the term was favored by one school more than another. Although absent, to be sure, from almost all Pāli canonical literature, the apparently related term *yogāvacara* does appear rather often in post-canonical Pāli literature.<sup>138</sup> Since we can positively identify the term *yogācāra* or *yogāvacara* in texts of at least the Theravāda, Mahāsāṃghika, and Sarvāstivāda (and possibly Sautrāntika)<sup>139</sup> schools, at least at this point it is not possible to assign its use alone any special sectarian significance. To the extent that *yogācāra* is a technical term, it seems possible that

\**yogin* (*ṛnal 'byor pa*) with *yogačari*. De Jong 1982: 204 quotes *ṛnal 'byor nyams kyi smang ba la as yogačari-ning tüzülmäklig köngül-dä*. The German translators render this with *Yogācārya*. The same is true in Kara and Zieme 1976: 47 (360, and note), 63 (9), 102, and 1977: 36 (100, with note), where again *yogačari* is rendered *Yogācārya*. But in 1977: 49 (287) the same authors render it with *yogācārin*. The Tibetan-Uigur vocabulary in 1977: 75 quotes for *ṛnal 'byor gyi dbang phyug* the Uigur *yogačarilar ilig*, but the Uigur glossary 1977: 147 quotes *yogačari* twice, once as equivalent to *yogācāra*, once to *yogācārya*, without explanation. Jan Nattier has informed me that Indic short final *a* is normally rendered in Uigur with *i*, and therefore the form *yogačari* does not support the form \**yogācārin*, but rather suggests that the translators had in mind *yogācāra*.

We may note that the same term appears also as a loan in Tocharian. At Sieg and Siegling 1949: 18 (9b5) of the text we find *yogācāl*, explained by the glossary (p. 158 of the translation and glossary) as representing the nominative plural *yogācāri*. See also p. 15 and n. 13 of the translation. This text is an *Udānālankāra*. In an Abhidharma text in Thomas 1964: 44 (XIII.29) we find *yogācāres*, translated in the glossary (p. 131) as "Yogabeflissener." I owe the indication of these sources to Davidson forthcoming, n. 29. I do not know if the word *yogācāra* or any similar or related form appears in Khotanese.

138. See Silk 1997 for a study of these materials.

139. Depending on how one understands the doctrinal standpoints of Vasubandhu and Āśvaghoṣa. Honjō has recently maintained that Āśvaghoṣa belonged to the Sarvāstivāda sect, and the Sautrāntika school (Honjō 1993: 28).

it is pan-Buddhist, although further studies will be required to clarify this impression.

In some ways these may seem rather bland conclusions. But one aspect of their importance lies precisely in this lack of specificity. One ramification of this lack of specificity may be that, if we wish to identify particular sectarian origins for the Mahāyāna sūtra or śāstra sources in which the term *yogācāra* appears or, even further, trace the origins of the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school, the results of the investigation undertaken above suggest that we probably cannot look to an analysis of the term *yogācāra* for help. The term seems to be too common, too generalized to be of assistance in this regard. This in turn suggests that, contrary to what some scholars have suggested, there may be no particular connection at all between the *yogācāra bhikṣu* per se and the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school, although this is far from a foregone conclusion. It is perfectly possible to imagine a group drawing particular inspiration from a pan-Buddhist notion and giving it special attention and emphasis. This is in fact a usual pattern in the development of schools.<sup>140</sup> We cannot, it therefore seems, pinpoint specific sources for the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda based on the appearance of the term *yogācāra* in any given text or text-group. Probably only a painstaking investigation of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda literary sources themselves, coupled with a survey of the scriptural sources appealed to by early Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda writers, can provide solid clues to the intellectual origins of the school.

### Bibliography

- Abhyankar, Vasudev Shastri. 1978. *Sarva-darśana-saṁgraha of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava*. Government Oriental Series, class A, no. 1. Third edition (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute).
- Andersen, Paul Kent. 1990. *Studies in the Minor Rock Edicts of Asoka I: Critical Edition* (Freiburg: Hedwig Falk).
- Apte, Vaman Shivaram. 1957. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Poona. Reprint: Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company, 1978).

140. Compare in this regard Gregory Schopen's 1977 investigations of the pan-Mahāyāna nature of the Sukhāvātī cult with the later rise of a specific "Pure Land Buddhism."

- Bendall, Cecil. 1897–1902. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching Compiled by Çāntideva, Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 1 (St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Bhattacharya, Ram Shankar. 1982. "Buddha as Depicted in the Purāṇas." *Purāṇa* 24/2: 384–404.
- Bhattacharya, Vidhushekhara. 1957. *The Yogācārabbūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga: The Sanskrit Text Compared with the Tibetan Version* (Calcutta: The University of Calcutta).
- BHSD Edgerton 1953.
- Bloch, Jules. 1950. *Les Inscriptions d'Asoka: traduites et commentées*. Collection Emile Senart (Paris: Société d'Édition «Les Belles Lettres»).
- Böhtlingk, Otto, and Rudolph Roth. 1855–1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (St. Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften). 7 volumes.
- Burnouf, Eugène. 1852. *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. Reprint: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1989).
- Cowell, Edward Byles, and A. E. Gough. 1904. *The Sarva-Darśana-Saṁgraha, or: Review of the different systems of Hindu philosophy* (Reprint: New Delhi: Cosmo Publications, 1976).
- Dantinne, Jean. 1983. *La Splendeur de l'Inébranlable (Akṣobhyavyūha)*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 29 (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain).
- Davidson, Ronald Mark. 1985. "Buddhist Systems of Transformation: Āśraya-parivṛtti-parāvṛtti Among the Yogācāra." Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- . Forthcoming. "Prolegomenon to Paracanonical: Category Construction and Textual Bundles in Three Meditative Traditions." To appear in C. Wedemeyer, ed., *Intercultural Transmission and Interpretation*.
- Deleanu, Florin. 1993. "Śrāvakayāna Yoga Practices and Mahāyāna Buddhism." *Waseda Daigaku Daigakuin Bungaku Kenkyūka Kiyō Bessatsu: Tetsugaku, Shigakuben* 早稲田大学大学院文学部研究紀要別冊: 哲学・史学編 20: 3–12.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1925. "Les Versions Chinoises du Milindapañha." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 24: 1–258.
- . 1954. "La Yogācārabbūmi de Saṅgharakṣa." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 44/2: 339–436.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1939–1959. *Gilgit Manuscripts*. 4 vols. in 9 pts. (Srinagar and Calcutta: J. C. Sarkhel at the Calcutta Oriental Press).
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Fukuhara Ryōgon 福原亮庵. 1975. *Bukkyō Gairon 仏教概論* (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂).
- Gómez, Luis Oscar. 1977. "The Bodhisattva as Wonder-worker." In Lewis Lancaster, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in honor of Edward Conze*. Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 1 (Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series): 221–261.

- Goshima Kiyotaka 五島清隆. 1981. *The Tibetan Text of the Brāhmaparipṛcchā (Brahmaṇiṣṣacintiparipṛcchā)*. Vol. I (Tib. bam po dañ po) (Takatsuki-shi, Japan: Goshima Kiyotaka).
- Griffiths, Paul J. 1986. *On Being Mindless: Buddhist Meditation and the Mind-Body Problem* (La Salle, Illinois: Open Court).
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1982. *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāśāṃghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 21 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
- . 1990. *Shōki Daijō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 初期大乘仏教の研究 II. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 4 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- Honjō Yoshifumi 本庄良文. 1993. "Memyō no Gakuha ni kansuru Senkō-gakusetsu no Ginmi: Jonsuton-setsu" 馬鳴の學派に関する先行學説の吟味—ジョンストン説—[E. H. Johnston's Arguments on the School Affiliation of Āśvaghoṣa]. In Egaku Mayeda 前田恵学 ed., *Watanabe Fumimaro Hakase Tsuitō Kinen Ronshū: Genshi Bukkyō to Daijō Bukkyō* 渡邊文磨追悼記念論集・原始仏教と大乘仏教 (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂): II.27-43.
- Hotori Rishō 阿理生. 1980. "Yugagyō to Yuishikisetsu" 瑜伽行と唯識説 [Yogācāra and the Consciousness-only theory]. In Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai 日本仏教学会, ed., *Bukkyō ni okeru Shugyō to sono Rironteki Konkyō* 仏教における修行とその理論的根拠 (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平楽寺書店): 73-85.
- Ishihama, Yumiko, and Yoichi Fukuda. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvīyutpatti*. Studia Tibetica 16. Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries 1 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko).
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. 1977. *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 4 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Jetly, J. S., and G. C. Parikh. 1991. *Nyāyakandalī, being a Commentary on Prasastapādabhāṣya, with three sub-commentaries*. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 174 (Baroda, India: Oriental Institute).
- Jinananda, B. 1969. *Abhisamācārikā (Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka)*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 9 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Johnston, Edward Hamilton. 1928, 1932. *The Saundarananda of Āśvaghoṣa* (London. Reprint: Delhi: Motilala Banarsidass, 1975).
- Jones, John James. 1949-1956. *The Mahāvastu* (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1973-1978).
- de Jong, Jan Willem. 1974. "Notes on the Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya of the Mahāśāṃghikas." In L. Cousins, ed., *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel): 63-70. Reprinted in *Buddhist Studies by J. W. de Jong*. Gregory Schopen, ed. (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1979): 297-304.
- . 1982. Review of Peter Zieme and György Kara, *Ein uigurisches Totenbuch*. Asiatische Forschungen 63 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1979). *Indo-Iranian Journal* 24: 162-166. Reprinted in J. W. de Jong, *Tibetan Studies*. Indica et Tibetica 25 (Swistal-Odendorf, Germany: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1994): 198-205. (I refer to the reprint.)

- Kajiyama Yuichi 梶山雄一, et al. 1994. *Satori e no Henreki: Kegonkyō Nyūbokaibon* さとりへの遍歴・華嚴經入法界品 [The Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra] (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha 中央公論社). Two volumes. [Translated by Kajiyama, Tanji Teruyoshi 丹治昭義, Tsuda Shin'ichi 津田真一, Tamura Chijun 田村智淳, and Katsura Shōryū 桂紹隆.]
- Kara, Georg, and Peter Zieme. 1976. *Fragmente tantrischer Werke in uigurischer Übersetzung*. Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients: Berliner Turfantexte VII (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).
- . 1977. *Die uigurischen Übersetzungen des Guruyogas "Tiefer Weg" von Sa-sakya Paṇḍita und der Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*. Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients: Berliner Turfantexte VIII (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).
- Kern, Hendrik. 1884. *The Saddharma-pundarīka, or The Lotus of the True Law*. Sacred Books of the East 21 (Oxford: Clarendon Press. I have used a reprint of 1909).
- Kern, Hendrik, and Bunyiu Nanjio. 1908-1912. *Saddharmapundarīka*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 10 (St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Kielhorn, Lorenz Franz. 1965. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. Adhāyas III, IV, and V*. Vol 2. 3rd ed., rev. by Kashinath Vasudev Abhyankar (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Institute). First published in 1883.
- Kimura, Takayasu. 1986. *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā II - III* (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin Publishing).
- Kodama Daien 小玉大圓, Nakayama Masaaki 中山正晃, and Chokkai Gentetsu 直海玄哲. 1992, 1993. "Yugashi to Zenkyōten no Kenkyū: Denshō no Mondaiten to Beunseki o chūshin ni" 瑜伽師と禪經典の研究・伝承の問題点と分析を中心に [Yogācāra and meditation sūtras]. 2 parts. *Ryūkoku Daigaku Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 龍谷大学佛教文化研究所紀要 31: 115-134, and 32: 166-179.
- Kubo, Tsugunari, and Akira Yuyama. 1991. *The Lotus Sutra: The White Lotus of the Marvelous Law*. BDK English Tripitaka 13-1 (Tokyo and Berkeley: Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai).
- Lamotte, Étienne Paul Marie. 1935. *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra: L'Explication des Mystères*. Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie 2e Série, 34e Fascicule (Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil/Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve).
- . 1975. *La Concentration de la Marche Héroïque (Śūramgamasamādhi-sūtra)*. Mélanges chinois et bouddhique 13 (Bruxelles: Institut Belge des hautes Études Chinoises).
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1903-1913. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamika-sūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapādā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4 (St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- . 1909. *Bouddhisme: Opinions sur l'Histoire de la Dogmatique*. Études sur l'Histoire des Religions 2 (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne & Cie.).



- . 1923–1931. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu* (Paris: Geuthner. Reprint: *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 16, Brussels: Institut Belge des hautes Études Chinoises, 1971).
- . 1928–1929. *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: La Siddhi de Hiuan-Tsang*. Buddhica Première série: Mémoires, Vol. 1, 5 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner). 2 vols.
- . 1937. "Musila et Nārada: Le chemin du nirvāṇa." *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 5: 189–222.
- Leumann, Ernst, and Shiraishi Shindō 白石眞道. 1957. "Mahāvastu, Heft II." *Yamanashi Daigaku Geigakubu Kiyō* 山梨大學藝學部紀要/Proceedings of the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Education, Yamanashi University 2: 1–133. Reprinted in *Shiraishi Shindō Bukkyōgaku Ronbunshū* 白石眞道・仏教学論文集 [The Collected Papers of Shiraishi Shindō]. Shiraishi Hisako 白石寿子 (ed.) (Sagamihara-shi, Japan: Kyōbi Shuppansha 京美出版社, 1988): 79–208. It is stated: "übersetzt von Prof. Dr. Ernst Leumann ... in Verbindung mit Shindō Shiraishi."
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1911. *Mahāyāna-Sūtrālamkāra: Exposé de la Doctrine du Grand Véhicule, Selon le Système Yogācāra*. Vol. II: Traduction—Introduction—Index. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études: Sciences Historiques et Philologiques 190 (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion. Reprint: Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company, 1983).
- Matsunami Seiren 松濤誠廉. 1954. "Yugagyōha no So toshite no Memyō" 瑜伽行派の祖としての馬鳴 [Aśvaghōṣa as a patriarch of the Yogācāra school]. *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 39: 191–224. Reprinted in Matsunami 1981: 158–181, to which I refer.
- . 1981. *Memyō: Tansei naru Nanda* 馬鳴・端正なる難陀 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房仏書林).
- Matsunami Seiren, et al. 1975. *Hokekyō* 法華經 I [The *Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra*]. *Daijō Butten* 大乘仏典 4 (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha 中央公論社).
- Miyamoto Shōson 宮本正尊. 1932. "Shin, Shiki, Funbetsu to Konpon Funbetsu" 心・識・分別と根本分別 [citta, vijñāna, vikalpa and mūla-vikalpa]. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 9/5 (new series): 759–794.
- . 1933. "Konpon Funbetsu no Kenkyū" 根本分別の研究 [The *mūla-vikalpa*]. In *Tokiwa Hakase Kanreki Kinen: Bukkyō Ronsō* 常盤博士還暦記念・佛教論叢 (Tokyo: Kōbundo 弘文堂): 353–498 (esp. 376–409). Reprinted in Hirakawa Akira 平川彰, Saigusa Mitsuyoshi 三枝充恵, and Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道, eds., *Miyamoto Shōson Hakase Bukkyōgaku Ronshū: Bukkyōgaku no Konpon Mondai* 宮本正尊博士仏教学論集・仏教学の根本問題 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 1985): 162–180, 191–197.
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元. 1956. *Genshi Bukkyō* 原始仏教. Sāra sōsho サーラ叢書 4 (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平楽寺書店).
- Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨. 1932–1936. *Bukkyō Daijiten* 佛教大辭典 (Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai 世界聖典刊行協会).
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).

- Mukai Akira 向井亮. 1978. "Yōgācyāra (yugagyō)-ha no Gakuamei no Yurai" ヨーガーチャーラ (瑜伽行) 派の学派名の由来 [The origins of the name of the Yogācāra school]. *Sanzō* 三蔵 153: originally distributed with the reprint edition of the *Kokuyaku Issaikyō, Ronshūbu* 國譯一切經・論集部 6. Reprinted in *Kokuyaku Issaikyō Indo Senjutsubu Geppō: Sanzōshū* 國譯一切經印度撰述部月報・三蔵集 4 (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppan 大東出版, 1978): 267–273.
- . 1979. "Ken'yō shōgyō-ron to Yuga shiji-ron" 『顯揚聖教論』と『瑜伽師地論』 [On the *Sāsanodbhāvana* and the *Yogācārabbūmi*]. *Bukkyōgaku* 佛教學 8: 39–68.
- Mvy. *Mahāvvyutpatti*. See Sakaki 1916, and Ishihama and Fukuda 1989.
- Nagao Gadjin 長尾雅人. 1982, 1987. *Shōdaijōron: Wayaku to Chūkai* 撰大乘論・和訳と注解 [The *Mahāyānasamgraha*: Japanese Translation and Commentary]. Indo Koten Sōsho インド古典叢書. 2 vols. (Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社).
- . 1994. *An Index to Asaṅga's Mahāyānasamgraha*. Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series 9. 2 vols. (Tokyo: The International Institute of Buddhist Studies).
- Nagao Gadjin and Sakurabe Hajime 桜部健. 1974. *Hōshakubu Kyōten* 宝積部經典 [Mahāratnakūṭa texts]. *Daijō Butten* 大乘仏典 9 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha 中央公論社).
- Nakada Norio 中田祝夫. 1989. *Myōichi Kinenkan-bon Kanagaki Hokekyō* 妙一記念館本・仮名書き法華經 (Tokyo: Reiyūkai 霊友会).
- Nakamura Hajime 中村元. 1993. "Yogācāra: 'yugagyō' ka? 'yugashi' ka?" Yogācāra・「瑜伽行」か? 「瑜伽師」か? [Yogācāra: yoga practice or practitioner of yoga?]. *Tōbō* 東方 9: 72–75.
- Nanjio, Bunyiu. 1923. *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1 (Reprint: Kyoto: Otani University Press, 1956).
- Nishi Giyū 西義雄. 1939. "Buha Bukkyō ni okeru Yugashi to sono Yakuwari" 部派仏教に於ける瑜伽師とその役割 [The yogācāra in Sectarian Buddhism and his role]. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 3/1. Reprinted in Nishi 1975: 219–265, to which I refer.
- . 1974. "Buha Bukkyō Kyōdan Gojisha toshite no Yugagyōsha no Jissen" 部派仏教教団護持者としての瑜伽行者の実践 [The practice of the yogācāra as a protector of the Sectarian Buddhist community]. Extracted from the latter half of "Datsuma Izen no Indo no Denryū Kenkyū Josetsu" 達磨以前のインドの伝流研究序説, in *Zenbunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 禪文化研究所紀要 6. Reprinted in Nishi 1975: 351–374, to which I refer.
- . 1975. *Abidatsuma Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 阿毘達磨仏教の研究 [Studies in Abhidharma Buddhism] (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会).
- Nishimura Minori 西村実則. 1974. "Daishubu-Setsushussebu ni okeru Yōgācyāra" 大衆部・説出世部におけるヨーガーチャーラ [Yogācāra in the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 32/2: 915–918.
- Nolot, Édith. 1991. *Règles de Discipline des Nonnes Bouddhistes*. Collège de France, Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne 60 (Paris: Collège de France).

- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1966. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies VI." *Journal of the Oriental Institute (Baroda)* 16: 113-119. Reprinted in *Collected Papers: Volume I* (Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1990): 77-84.
- Pradhan, Prahlād. 1975. *Abhidharmakośabbāṣyam of Vasubandhu*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works 8 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Régamey, Konstanty. 1938. *The Bhadrāmāyākāvyākaraṇa: Introduction, Tibetan Text, Translation and Notes*. The Warsaw Society of Sciences and Letters, Publications of the Oriental Commission Nr. 3 (Warsaw: Nakładem Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego Wydano z Zasilku Funduszu Kultury J. Piłsudskiego).
- Roth, Gustav. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Manual of Discipline for Buddhist Nuns*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 12 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1967. "On a Yoga Treatise in Sanskrit from Qizil." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 87/1: 157-165.
- Saeki Kyokuga 佐伯旭雅. 1887. *Kandō Abidatsuma Kusharon* 冠導阿毘達磨俱舍論. 3 vols. (continuous pagination) (photo reprint of woodblock edition: Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1978).
- Sakaki Ryōsaburō 榊亮三郎. 1916. *Mahāvīyūtpatti* (Kyoto: Kyōto Teikoku Daigaku Bunka Daigaku Sōsho 京都帝國大學文科大學叢書 3. Numerous reprints.)
- Sakuma, Hidenori S. 1990. *Die Āśrayaparivṛtti-Theorie in der Yogācārabhūmi*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 40. 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner).
- Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1991. "Biku to Gigaku" 比丘と伎楽 [Monastic worship of stūpas with music and dance in vinaya texts]. *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 佛教史學研究 34/1: 1-24.
- Schlingloff, Dieter. 1964. *Ein Buddhistisches Yogalehrbuch*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 7 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
- Schmidt, Richard. 1928. *Nachträge zum Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in Kürzer Fassung von Otto Böhtlingk* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz. Reprint: Tokyo: Meicho Fukyukai, 1983).
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1976. "On the Problem of the Relation of Spiritual Practice and Philosophical Theory in Buddhism." In *German Scholars on India II* (Bombay: Nachiketa Publications): 235-250.
- Schopen, Gregory. 1977. "Sukhāvatī as a Generalized Religious Goal in Sanskrit Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 19: 177-210.
- . 1992. "On Avoiding Ghosts and Social Censure: Monastic Funerals in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20: 1-39.
- . 1995. "Monastic Law Meets the Real World: A Monk's Continuing Right to Inherit Family Property in Classical India." *History of Religions* 35/2: 101-123.
- Senart, Émile Charles Marie. 1882-1897. *Le Mahāvastu*. Société Asiatique, Collection d'Ouvrages Orientaux, Seconde Série. 3 vols. (Paris: Imprimerie National. Reprint: Tokyo: Meicho Fukyukai, 1977).

- Shāstrī, Haraprasād. 1931. "Chips from a Buddhist Workshop." In Bimala Churn Law, ed., *Buddhist Studies* (Calcutta: Thacker Spink. Reprint: Delhi/Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1983): 818-858.
- Shastri, Swami Dwarikadas. 1971. *Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Acharya Vasubandhu with Sphutārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*. Bauddha Bharati Series 6 (Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati).
- Shukla, Karunesha. 1973. *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 14 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Sieg, Emil, and Wilhelm Siegling. 1949. *Tocharische Sprachreste: Sprache B. Heft 1: Die Udānālankāra-Fragmente* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Silk, Jonathan Alan. 1994. "The Origins and Early History of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism, with a Study of the *Ratnarāśīsūtra* and Related Materials." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan.
- . 1997. "Further remarks on the *yogācāra bhikṣu*." In *Dharmadūta: Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thich Huyēn-Vi à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Bhikkhu Pāsādika and Bhikkhu Tampalawela Dhammaratana, eds. (Paris: Éditions You Feng): 233-250.
- Snellgrove, David L. 1959. *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study*. Part II: Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts. London Oriental Series 6 (London: Oxford University Press).
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander Wilhelm, Baron von. 1926. *The Kāyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press).
- Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro, and Hokei Idzumi. 1949. *The Gandavyūha Sūtra* (Kyoto: The Society for the Publication of Sacred Books of the World. Originally published 1934).
- Suzuki, Kōshin. 1994a. *Sanskrit Fragments and Tibetan Translation of Candrakīrti's Bodhisattvayogācāracaṭuṣṭakaṭīkā*. (Tokyo: The Sankibo Press).
- . 1994b. *Index to the Sanskrit Fragments and Tibetan Translation of Candrakīrti's Bodhisattvayogācāracaṭuṣṭakaṭīkā*. Sanskrit-Tibetan (Tokyo: The Sankibo Press).
- T. *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*.
- Takasaki Jikido 高崎直道. 1966. *Bukkyōshi Gaisetsu—Indo-ben 佛教史概説・インド篇* [History of buddhism—India] (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店). The book is co-authored with Sasaki Kyōgo 佐々木教悟, Inokuchi Taijun 井ノ口泰淳, and Tsukamoto Keisho 塚本啓祥.
- . 1974. *Nyoraizō Shisō no Keisei: Indo Daijō Bukkyō Shisō Kenkyū* 如来藏思想の形成・インド大乘佛教思想研究 [Formation of the Tathāgatagarbha Theory]. (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- . 1993. "Giyaku Nyūryōgakyō no 'Nyōjitsu Shūgyō' to Kishinron" 魏訳『入楞伽經』の「如実修行」と『起信論』 [The term *rushi xiuxing* in the Wei translation of the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* and the *Awakening of Faith*]. In Tsukamoto Keishō Kyōju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 塚本啓祥教授還暦記念論文集刊行会, eds., *Tsukamoto Keishō Kyōju Kanreki Kinen*

- Ronbunshū: Chi no Kaikō—Bukkyō to Kagaku* 塚本啓祥教授還暦記念論文集・知の邂逅—仏教と科学 (Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha 佼成出版社): 223–238.
- Taranatha Nyaya-Tarkatirtha and Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha. 1936–1944. *Nyāyadarśanam with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotkara's [sic] Vārttika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyāṭikā & Viśvanātha's Vṛtti*. Calcutta Sanskrit Series nos. 18 and 19 (Calcutta: Metropolitan Printing & Publishing House Limited. Reprint: Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1985).
- Thakkur, Kanaklāl. 1987. *Kumārasambhavam—Mahākāvyaṃ of Mahākavi Kālidāsa with Sañjivinī and Sīsubitaiṣinī Commentaries by Mallinātha and Sītārām Kavi*. Kashi Sanskrit Series 14 (Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan).
- Thomas, Werner. 1964. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band II: Texte und Glossar* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag).
- Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽. 1958. *Yugaron Kenkyū* 瑜伽論研究. Daijō Bukkyō Kenkyū 大乘佛教研究 II (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店).
- . 1965. *Indo Tetsugaku Kenkyū* 印度哲學研究 I (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店).
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1965. *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden I. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland X, 1* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).
- . 1971. *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden III. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland X, 3* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).
- Watson, Burton. 1993. *The Lotus Sutra* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Wayman, Alex. 1961. *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript*. University of California Publications in Classical Philology 17 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
- Wogihara Unrai. 1904. "Bouddhisme. Notes et Bibliographie: Contributions to the study of the Śikṣasamuccaya derived from Chinese sources (1) (Continuation) and (end)," *Le Muséon* (New Series) 5: 96–103, 209–215, 7: 255–261.
- . 1932–1935. *Abhisamayālaṃkāraḥ Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā*. Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2 (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko. Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1973).
- Yamada, Isshi. 1968. *Karunāpūṇḍarīka*. 2 vols. (London: The School of Oriental and African Studies).
- Yamada Ryūjō 山田龍城. 1959. *Daijō Bukkyō Seiritsuron Josetsu* 大乘佛教成立論序説 (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平樂寺書店).
- Yamaguchi, Susumu. 1934. *Madhyāntavibhāṅgāṭikā: Exposition Systématique du Yogācāravijñaptivāda*. Tome I—Texte. Suzuki Research Foundation Reprint Series 7 (Nagoya: Librarie Hajinkaku. Reprint: Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1966).
- Yin Shun 印順. 1988. *Shouyiqieyoubuweishe de Lunshu yu Lunshi zhi Yanjiu* 說一切有部爲主的論書與論師之研究 (Taipei: Zhengwen Chubun 正聞出版).

## Manuscript Fragments, Texts, and Inscriptions in the Temple of Tabo

An Interim Report with Bibliography\*

Ernst Steinkellner

Tabo<sup>1</sup> monastery in the Spiti valley of the Indian Himalayas was founded in 996 C.E. That it survived and can give us an idea today of the minds which created it is a miracle of history.<sup>2</sup> The manuscript fragments remaining at Tabo are a part of this miracle, and are of far-reaching import for Tibetan philology and Kanjur studies in particular. This treasure of Tabo as such is, in fact, just the visible tip of an iceberg, to whose hidden bulk I would compare the still unidentified remains of an independent western Tibetan manuscript tradition which lasted from its beginnings in the tenth century until the advance of central Tibetan traditions in the seventeenth century. Despite the fact that this western Tibetan manuscript tradition has so far only been verified and exemplified by the Tabo collection, I venture to assert that its value for the history of the transmission of Tibetan canonical literature is in all probability second only to the Tibetan holdings of the Dunhuang library cave. Yet the unveiling of this treasure has taken nearly a hundred years, or three generations of scholars: first A. H. Francke in 1909, then Giuseppe Tucci and Eugenio Ghersi in 1933, and finally a small Italian-Austrian group who visited in 1991. Two world wars and two Tibetan catastrophes—the exile of

\* Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Nihon Chibetto Gakkai, Nov. 1, 1997, at Kyoto University. The presence of Prof. Nagao Gadjin and his kind interest in the subject are my reasons for offering it to this volume in his celebration.

Gratefully I acknowledge the help received from Cristina Scherrer-Schaub and Paul Harrison, as well as the support of the Austrian Fund for the Promotion of Science for the research on the Tabo literary heritage.

1. The proper old spelling of modern Tabo and the etymology of the name are unclear. The name can hardly be Tibetan. Several different etymologized spellings such as *lta*, *rta*, *sta* can be found, and the variations *po/pho/bo* are also attested in inscriptions and manuscripts. For the sake of convenience, we earlier followed the proposal of Klimburg-Salter to use the spelling *Ta pho* (1987: n.9). At the last meeting of the Tabo research group in Vienna (January 19–20, 1996) it was decided to abstain in future from this or similar differentiations, and to return to the modern spelling "Tabo."

2. For a comprehensive introduction to this cultural treasure cf. D. Klimburg-Salter, *Tabo—a Lamp for the Kingdom*, Milan, 1997.

STUDIES IN THE BUDDHIST TRADITIONS

Studies in the Buddhist Traditions

---

*a publication of the  
Institute for the Study of Buddhist Traditions  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan*

Series Editor  
Luis O. Gómez  
The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Editorial Board  
Carl Bielefeldt  
Stanford University, Palo Alto

Donald S. Lopez  
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Gregory Schopen  
University of California, Los Angeles

Daniel Stevenson  
University of Kansas, Lawrence

# WISDOM, COMPASSION, AND THE SEARCH FOR UNDERSTANDING

---

The Buddhist Studies Legacy  
of Gadjin M. Nagao

*Edited by  
Jonathan A. Silk*



**2000**

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII PRESS, HONOLULU