

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*.¹ 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.²

When the word *yogācāra* is defined by dictionaries of Classical Sanskrit, its primary sense is given as “the practice or observance of Yoga.”³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵

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* (Thakkur 1987).

4. The last verse of Prāsastapāda’s *Padārthadharmasamgraha* (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-vaiśeṣaḥ ekatrānavasthānam ityādi yatidharmoktam*. “*Yogācāra* is the practice of renunciators 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 Bhṛṅgu) reads: *yogācāryō mahābuddhir daityanām abhavad gurur | surānām cāpi meghāvī brahmacārī yatavratāḥ |* |. Nilakaṇṭha comments: *yogācārya iti cāpi vyastau | surānām api ca gurur iti sambandbaḥ | devānām gurur eva yogācāryō yogabalena kāyadvayam kṛtvā devānām apy ācāryō bhavad ity arthaḥ |* ...; 12.59.91: *adhyāyānām sahasreṇa kāvyāḥ samkṣepam abravīt | tac chāstram amitaprajñō yogācāryō mahātapāḥ |* |; 16.5.23: *tato*

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

rājan bhagavān ugratejā nārāyaṇaḥ prabhavaś cāvyaś ca | yogācāryō rodasī vyāpya lakṣmīyā śbānam 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 Purāna* 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 *Śivapurāna* II.5.16.11. The verse reads (edition Shri Venkateshvara Press, Bombay, 1965): *namas te gūḍha-debāya 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*.¹⁰ The standard Tibetan equivalent of the Sanskrit, *ṛnal 'byor spyod pa*, fully supports the form *yogācāra*.¹¹ 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:¹² “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 *yogacaryā*, 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 *babuvrīhi* is especially hard to understand in its Chinese guise, but the reading 師有瑜伽 could support **yogācāra*, which as a *babuvrīhi* 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 *babuvrīhi* 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 *babuvrīhi*. 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 (**sādhyā*), and thus it is called *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, which is a *babuvrīhi*.” 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 *babuvrīhi*. 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 *babuvrīhi*: ‘a teacher who possesses *yoga* (?)’ This is also a *tatpuruṣa*, and not a *babuvrīhi*.” 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 *babuvrīhi*.” 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*.¹³ However, Kuiji’s knowledge of Sanskrit grammar is suspect, and the interpretation of his Korean colleague Toryun 道倫 (better Tullyun 道倫?)¹⁴ 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*.¹⁵ 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 *babuvrīhi*. 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 *babuvrīhi*. [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 [*babuvrīhi*, *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 *babuvrīhi*, literally “one who has yoga as his practice” or “one who carries out his practice through yoga,” and thus “a practitioner of yoga.”¹⁶ 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-aṅ*).¹⁷ According to the explanation of Madhav Deshpande, this rule allows the derivation of a compound with *ācāra* as an agentive final member, namely *yogam ācarati iti yogācārah*.¹⁸ Without test forms such as **yogācāraka*, we cannot then be certain whether the term should actually be understood as a *babuvrīhi*.¹⁹ It is, however, as Prof. Deshpande further pointed out, so understood in the *Abhidhānarājendra* (s.v. *jogāyāra*), *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 *babuvrīhi*.

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 *-aṅ* 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 *zuo chan biqiu* 坐禪比丘 seems very often to correspond to *yogācāra bhikṣu*, *zuo chan* 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 *zuo chan* 坐禪.²⁰ The same Chinese term may also render other Sanskrit terms.²¹ 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.²² Here Xuanzang's translation is entirely consistent, with *yogācāra* both times rendered with the transcription-cum-translation *yuqieshi* 瑜伽師.²³ 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, *yuqieshi* 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*.²⁴ 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 bzhin du bsam gtan par gyur*.

In the *Samādhivirājasūtra*, chapter 28 (Dutt 1939–59: II.163.1), *daśeme 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 *pratisamlīna* (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。教何等入修。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.²⁵ But, alas, this is not always and universally the case. In Xuanzang's translation of an *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* passage quoted below, three types of *yogācāra* are rendered with two terms, *yuqieshi* 瑜伽師 and *guanxingzhe* 觀行者.²⁶ In another spot, *yuqieshi* 瑜伽師 renders *yogin*.²⁷ 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*.²⁸ 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.²⁹ 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.³⁰ 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*.³¹ 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 *Vaiḥāṣika* is based on the (*Mahā-*) *Vibhāṣā*, the Sautrāntika on the sūtras, and the *Madhyamaka* on the *Mūlamadhyamaka kārikās*. What he means is that as *Vaiḥāṣikas* 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 *Vaiḥāṣika* 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 *Ābhidhārmikas*. 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

