Yogācāra and Madhyamaka: From Philosophical Discernment to Contemplative Realization

The historical development of two Mahāyāna approaches to consciousness, emptiness, and the cultivation of liberating wisdom

1. Historical Foundations

The development of Madhyamaka and Yogācāra within Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism produced two influential accounts of ignorance and its cessation, differing not only in their philosophical interpretations of reality but also in the objects, methods, and intended results of contemplative investigation. Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, conventionally dated to the second or third century CE, subjects the presumed intrinsic existence (*svabhāva*) of phenomena to sustained analysis, extending the implications of dependent origination to causation, identity, perception, and all possible objects of knowledge. The Yogācāra literature, developed particularly through the *Yogācārabhūmi*, *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*, and works associated with Asaṅga and Vasubandhu, elaborates a different investigation, directed toward the conditioned constitution of experience, the apparent separation of apprehending subject and apprehended object, and the transformation of the cognitive processes sustaining that division.

Both traditions inherit the Mahāyāna understanding that liberation requires wisdom (*prajñā*) extending beyond conceptual assent, yet neither regards philosophical discernment as dispensable. The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* integrates systematic investigation into contemplative cultivation, while the later Madhyamaka *Bhāvanākrama* literature explicitly incorporates analytic discernment within meditation. Their differences must therefore be examined not as an opposition between intellectual and experiential methods, but through their respective accounts of what ignorance misconstrues, how that misconception is investigated, and what constitutes its realization and cessation.

2. Yogācāra: Representation, Contemplative Investigation, and the Transformation of Cognition

The philosophical basis of practice

Vasubandhu's *Viṃśikā* (*Twenty Verses*) challenges the assumption that perceived objects exist independently of consciousness merely because they appear to do so. The text considers objections concerning the spatial and temporal regularity of perception, agreement among different observers, and the causal efficacy of experienced objects. Vasubandhu employs dream experience to demonstrate that appearances may possess determinate experiential characteristics without corresponding to independently existing objects in the manner ordinarily presumed, while his analysis of material constituents challenges the attempt to establish such objects through supposedly indivisible atoms.

The importance of this argument for contemplation is that the apparent externality of objects ceases to be accepted as sufficient evidence of their independent existence. Nevertheless, Vasubandhu's reasoning does not establish that the mere recognition of cognitive dependence constitutes realization; the apparent independence of the experiencing subject itself remains to be investigated.

The *Triṃśikā* (*Thirty Verses*) develops this analysis through the eight-consciousness model. In addition to sensory and discriminative consciousness, Yogācāra describes the afflicted *manas*, associated with appropriating experience as self, and *ālayavijñāna*, the conditioned storehouse consciousness associated with karmic seeds (*bīja*) and habitual dispositions (*vāsanā*). The latter is not a concealed permanent self, but an account of continuity through which previous activity conditions subsequent cognition, including the persistent apprehension of an independently existing experiencer confronting an independently existing world.

The Three Natures (*trisvabhāva*) specify the relation between this misconception and the nature realized through its cessation. The imagined nature (*parikalpita*) is the falsely established duality of apprehender and apprehended; the dependent nature (*paratantra*) is the conditioned process in which that duality appears; and the perfected nature (*pariniṣpanna*) is the absence of the imagined duality within that dependent process (*Triṃśikā*, 20–25). These are not successive ontological realms, but distinctions between the manner in which experience is misconstrued, the conditions of its occurrence, and what is disclosed when the misconception is absent.

The four investigations and the analysis of designation

An early and particularly concrete expression of Yogācāra contemplative investigation appears in the *Tattvārthapaṭala*, or Chapter on Reality, of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. The text introduces four investigations (*catasraḥ paryeṣaṇāḥ*) and their corresponding correct cognitions (*yathāb-*

hūtaparijñāna), concerning names, things, designations of intrinsic nature, and designations of distinctions.

The first two investigations distinguish the linguistic designation from what is designated, examining each without presupposing the independent identity ordinarily attributed to their relationship. The third and fourth investigate how essential characteristics and differentiating properties are imputed through conceptual determination. Their corresponding correct cognitions disclose the status of these designations and the error involved in taking the conceptualized nature of a phenomenon as intrinsically established.

For the practitioner, this is not merely a semantic exercise. Ordinary experience involves the continual attribution of identity, qualities, and relationships to perceived phenomena; the investigations disclose how conceptual determination contributes to the apparent independence of these structures. Florin Deleanu's historical analysis demonstrates their importance in early Yogācāra meditation theory, while cautioning against reconstructing them as a universally prescribed sequence of meditation sessions. They constitute investigative principles whose contemplative application develops through sustained discernment rather than a fixed procedural formula.

The meditative image and investigating consciousness

The *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*, chapter 8, provides a more explicit account of the relationship between philosophical understanding and meditative practice. In the dialogue with Maitreya, the Buddha describes how the practitioner receives, memorizes, examines, and contemplates the teachings before establishing inwardly directed attention and the pliancy associated with mental stillness (*śamatha*). Insight (*vipaśyanā*) subsequently examines the meditative image through discrimination and investigation according to the meaning of the teachings already understood (8.3–4).

The decisive passage occurs in section 8.7, where Maitreya asks whether the image appearing as an object of concentration is distinct from mind. The Buddha replies:

> *"This image is merely a representation."*

When Maitreya subsequently asks how mind could investigate itself if the meditative image is not distinct from it, the reply denies that one ultimately established phenomenon investigates another. The apparent distinction between consciousness and its meditative object is illustrated through a reflection in a mirror: although the image appears separate from the form reflected, the apparent relation does not establish two independently existing objects in the manner presumed.

The argument thus becomes operative within contemplation. The practitioner initially investigates the status of the meditative image, but the inquiry necessarily extends to the supposed consciousness apprehending that image. Merely identifying objects as representations

would leave the subject–object division intact if consciousness itself were preserved as an independent observer.

The significance of section 8.7 is therefore not simply its affirmation of representation-only, but its demonstration that the philosophical insight must be extended to the structure of the contemplative act itself. Section 8.9 connects this understanding with attention directed toward true reality, while later passages distinguish the development of insight from the more advanced realization associated with the path of seeing.

Non-dual wisdom and transformation of the basis

Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikā*, verses 26–29, clarifies why even a correct conceptual understanding of representation-only remains insufficient. Verse 27 states that establishing something as consciousness-only still involves apprehension of an object, and therefore does not constitute realization of the doctrine's intended meaning. Verse 28 relates the absence of apprehended objects to the corresponding absence of an apprehending subject, while verse 29 associates supramundane, non-conceptual wisdom with transformation of the basis (*āśraya-parāvṛtti*).

The progression is philosophically consequential. The investigation begins by challenging the independent existence of perceived objects, but it cannot terminate with the assertion of a consciousness that independently apprehends them. The apparent subject–object structure itself must be overcome, together with the habitual dispositions through which that structure continually reappears.

The *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* makes an additional distinction in section 8.36. Having described the refinement of contemplative investigation, it identifies the arising of direct, personal gnosis of true reality with the bodhisattva's path of seeing and entry into the first bodhisattva stage. Subsequent cultivation is then associated with the progressive purification of remaining obscurations, compared in the text to the repeated refinement of gold. Initial realization and the completion of purification are therefore explicitly distinguished.

This provides a more exact account of transformation than the assertion that the practitioner eventually experiences non-duality. The path involves the development of discernment, a qualitative breakthrough in realization, and continued purification of the cognitive and dispositional conditions that remain operative. The texts do not reduce these developments to a single psychological event or a temporary suspension of ordinary mental activity.

3. Madhyamaka: Intrinsic Existence, Contemplative Analysis, and the Realization of Emptiness

Dependent origination as the basis of investigation

Madhyamaka directs its investigation toward the intrinsic existence attributed to phenomena, including persons, consciousness, and the apparent constituents of experience. Nāgārjuna's *Mūla-madhyamakakārikā* opens by examining four proposed modes of arising—from self, from other, from both, and without cause—and demonstrates the difficulties entailed by treating causes and effects as independently established entities. The argument concerns ultimately established production, not the evident operation of conventional causation.

Its significance for liberation becomes explicit in chapter 24, where an opponent maintains that emptiness would invalidate the Four Noble Truths, causal efficacy, and the possibility of spiritual transformation. Nāgārjuna reverses the objection: if phenomena possessed immutable intrinsic natures, their arising, cessation, and transformation would be unintelligible. Dependent origination is therefore not threatened by emptiness but requires the absence of independent intrinsic existence.

In verse 24.18, dependent origination is identified with emptiness and dependent designation, thereby establishing that the absence of intrinsic nature does not entail the nonexistence of conventional phenomena. What is negated is not the functioning phenomenon, but the mode of existence imputed to it.

This distinction determines the contemplative investigation. If the practitioner negates conventional reality rather than intrinsic existence, the analysis fails through excessive negation; if the supposed intrinsic nature remains unexamined, the principal object of ignorance is preserved. The accuracy with which the object of negation is identified is therefore inseparable from the effectiveness of the practice.

Candrakīrti's analysis of the person

Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakāvatāra*, chapter 6, provides an important demonstration of philosophical argument employed as contemplative investigation. In verse 6.120, the examination is explicitly directed toward the self apprehended through the view of the perishing aggregates (*satkāyadṛṣṭi*), rather than merely toward the permanent self proposed by certain philosophical systems.

The distinction matters because the rejection of a permanent soul does not necessarily undermine the habitual conviction that an independently established person exists as the subject of experience. Candrakīrti consequently turns to the self ordinarily appropriated through the aggregates, stating that:

"the meditator makes a refutation of the self."

His sevenfold analysis, developed through the chariot analogy in verses 6.150–165, investigates whether the person can be established as identical with the aggregates, separate from them, their possessor, their support or what they support, their collection, or their particular configuration.

The force of the analysis is that each proposed relation fails to establish the person as an independently existing entity. Yet the failure does not abolish the conventional person: just as a chariot is designated in dependence upon its components, the person remains intelligible through dependent designation.

What is relinquished is thus neither the conventional person nor the functioning of experience, but the intrinsic existence attributed to the person through habitual self-identification. Dhivan Thomas Jones's examination of Candrakīrti's argument emphasizes this practical orientation, distinguishing the refutation of a speculative permanent self from the more radical undermining of ordinary ego-identification.

This interpretation makes the contemplative purpose of the reasoning explicit. The argument must be directed toward the actual apprehension of selfhood, not merely accepted as an abstract demonstration of the absence of a permanent soul.

Analysis within meditative cultivation

Kamalaśīla's eighth-century *Bhāvanākrama* treatises provide a systematic account of the relationship between such investigation and contemplative cultivation. As a disciple of Śāntarakṣita, Kamalaśīla inherited a synthesis of Buddhist epistemology, Yogācāra analysis, and Madhyamaka reasoning; his presentation should therefore be understood as a particular historical development rather than the exclusive practice system of all Madhyamaka traditions.

The treatises integrate compassion, bodhicitta, meditative stabilization, and the discernment of reality. Mental stillness permits sustained engagement with an object without continual distraction, while insight investigates the nature of what is apprehended, including the absence of self in persons and phenomena. The investigation is conducted within cultivation rather than confined to a prior intellectual exercise whose conclusions are subsequently contemplated without further examination.

Martin T. Adam's study of the *Bhāvanākrama* texts is especially significant because it distinguishes ordinary reflective understanding from the discernment of reality (*bhūtapratyavekṣā*) operative within meditation. Such discernment may remain conceptually articulated while constituting a form of meditative wisdom (*bhāvanāmayī prajñā*) rather than merely reflective knowledge (*cintāmayī prajñā*).

Reasoning and stabilization therefore function reciprocally. Analysis identifies the presumed intrinsic existence of the object and demonstrates that it cannot be sustained; meditative stability supports continued engagement with that understanding, while further discrimination becomes necessary when the habitual apprehension of intrinsic existence reasserts itself.

Nor does the conventional activity of reasoning require an ultimately established reasoner. Since the investigating subject is itself dependently arisen, its conventional capacity to employ valid reasoning is not contradicted by the analysis of its intrinsic existence. The practitioner can investigate the presumed independent existence of the practitioner without first establishing the very entity under examination.

Direct realization and subsequent cultivation

Madhyamaka distinguishes inferential ascertainment of emptiness from its direct realization. A practitioner may establish through reasoning that intrinsically existing persons and phenomena cannot be found, while the habitual appearance and apprehension of such existence continue despite that conclusion. The purpose of contemplative cultivation is not simply to strengthen assent to the proposition, but to undermine the misconception through which intrinsic existence remains experientially convincing.

In path presentations employing the five-path structure, the path of seeing marks the initial direct, non-conceptual realization of ultimate truth, while the path of cultivation concerns the further abandonment of obscurations not eliminated by that breakthrough. These stages should not be confused with temporary degrees of meditative absorption or with a simple transition from thinking to the absence of thought.

Non-conceptual realization is not a more vivid inference, nor the apprehension of a separate ultimate entity called emptiness. It concerns the absence of the falsely imposed intrinsic nature, without thereby abolishing the dependent functioning of conventional phenomena. Subsequent cultivation remains necessary because habits of grasping and their associated obscurations may continue after initial realization.

The transformation is therefore not established by the occurrence of mental silence, unusual clarity, or a transient non-dual experience. It is distinguished by the realization of the specific absence investigated through Madhyamaka reasoning and by the progressive removal of the ignorance and dispositions that previously sustained its opposite.

Comparative Structure of Contemplative Inquiry

The following comparison summarizes the characteristic philosophical and contemplative orientations established in the preceding sections. It does not imply that either tradition possesses a single uniform practice system or that their methods are mutually exclusive.

Dimension	Yogācāra	Madhyamaka
Primary diagnosis of ignorance	Imputed duality of apprehender and apprehended, sustained through conditioned cognition	Grasping at intrinsic existence (*svabhāva*) in persons, phenomena, and consciousness
Principal object of investigation	The constitution of experience and the apparent separation between cognition and its objects	The presumed independent existence of whatever is apprehended or designated
Philosophical framework	Representation-only, Three Natures, eight-consciousness model	Dependent origination, emptiness, Two Truths, analysis of intrinsic existence
Representative contemplative methods	Four investigations of names and things; examination of meditative images and consciousness	Analysis of person and aggregates; investigation of arising, identity, and causation
Function of stabilization	Sustains investigation of representational and cognitive processes	Sustains examination of emptiness and familiarity with the absence disclosed through analysis
What is relinquished	Imagined subject–object duality and the dispositions sustaining its reproduction	Apprehension of intrinsic existence in persons and phenomena, including cognition itself
Direct realization	Non-dual wisdom disclosing the absence of imagined duality	Non-conceptual realization of the emptiness of intrinsic existence
Continuing transformation	Transformation of the basis (*āśraya-parāvṛtti*) and purification of remaining obscurations	Progressive abandonment of obscurations through continued cultivation
Principal interpretive danger	Reifying consciousness or the perfected nature	Mistaking emptiness for nonexistence or conceptual negation for realization
Principal textual evidence	*Bodhisattvabhūmi*; *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*; *Triṃśikā*	*Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*; *Madhyamakāvatāra*; *Bhāvanākrama*

The distinction may be expressed in concentrated form: Yogācāra investigates the constitution and misapprehension of dualistic experience, while Madhyamaka investigates the intrinsic existence attributed to whatever appears, including the cognitive process itself. Both inquiries can undermine the apprehension of independently established subject and object, although their accounts of ultimate reality and liberated cognition are not necessarily identical.

4. Historical Disagreement and the Possibility of Convergence

The disagreement between Yogācāra and Madhyamaka became explicit in the sixth-century writings of Bhāviveka, particularly chapter 5 of his *Madhyamakahṛdayakārikā* and the associated *Tarkajvālā* commentary. A central issue concerns the status of the perfected nature and the ultimate object of non-conceptual wisdom.

Influential Yogācāra formulations describe emptiness as the absence of imagined duality within conditioned cognition, thereby avoiding its interpretation as sheer nonexistence. Bhāviveka questions whether the resulting account of the perfected nature nevertheless establishes an ultimate reality possessing intrinsic existence.

In *Madhyamakahṛdayakārikā* 5.95, he asks how a doctrine characterizing ultimate nature through existence and the presence of nonexistence can escape the extremes of excessive affirmation and negation. The criticism concerns not merely philosophical terminology, but the status of the reality supposedly realized through non-conceptual knowledge.

For Yogācāra, the absence of imagined duality must be explained without reducing liberating wisdom to the cognition of nothing whatsoever. For Madhyamaka, the attempt to establish an ultimately existing cognitive basis risks perpetuating precisely the intrinsic existence that wisdom is intended to negate.

The dispute cannot therefore be resolved by asserting that both traditions realize an identical emptiness. Their differences concern the interpretation of what is realized and the ontological commitments implied by that interpretation.

An important historical integration appears in Śāntarakṣita's eighth-century *Madhyamakālaṃkāra*, especially verses 92–93. Śāntarakṣita employs representation-only reasoning to challenge the independent existence of external objects, while subsequently applying Madhyamaka analysis to consciousness itself, demonstrating that the cognitive basis cannot be preserved as intrinsically real.

The significance of this synthesis is methodological as well as philosophical. It shows that one analysis may serve as an effective instrument for overcoming a particular misconception while remaining open to a further investigation of its own assumptions. Such integration does not abolish doctrinal disagreement, but establishes a historically attested possibility of complementary contemplative inquiry.

Convergence should consequently be distinguished at three levels: similarity in the investigative methods employed, similarity in descriptions of non-dual realization, and identity of ultimate philosophical doctrine. The first is well supported, the second requires careful interpretation, and the third cannot be presumed from the preceding two.

5. The Maturation of Knowledge into Liberating Wisdom

The traditional distinction between wisdom arising from hearing (*śrutamayī prajñā*), reflection (*cintāmayī prajñā*), and cultivation (*bhāvanāmayī prajñā*) provides a common framework for understanding how philosophical discernment becomes transformative realization. These do not constitute three unrelated faculties: hearing establishes familiarity with the teachings, reflection investigates their meaning and validity, and cultivation develops understanding through

sustained contemplative engagement, with each activity contributing to the refinement of the others.

The *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* demonstrates this interaction through its account of the examination of meditative images, while Kamalaśīla's *Bhāvanākrama* develops a comparable integration of reasoning and meditation within a different philosophical synthesis. In both cases, the distinction between conceptual and non-conceptual knowledge cannot be reduced to the presence or absence of discursive thought.

A more decisive distinction concerns the relation between valid understanding and the ignorance that continues to operate despite it. Inferential ascertainment may establish that independently existing persons and phenomena cannot be found, while habitual self-grasping or imagined duality persists through deeply conditioned dispositions. Meditative cultivation brings that understanding into sustained contact with the relevant apprehension, preparing for the direct realization that distinguishes the path of seeing.

The *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* 8.36 is particularly instructive because it expressly separates the initial arising of direct gnosis from the continued purification undertaken on subsequent stages. Its comparison of later cultivation to the refinement of gold demonstrates that an initial breakthrough does not exhaust the path, even though it establishes a qualitative distinction between ordinary understanding and direct realization.

The distinction between meditative equipoise and subsequent attainment is equally consequential. The absence of discursive thought, vivid clarity, or a temporary non-dual state does not itself demonstrate the attainment of liberating wisdom; what matters is whether the particular ignorance identified by the tradition has been directly undermined and whether further cultivation progressively weakens the dispositions through which that ignorance recurs.

For Yogācāra, this concerns the overcoming of imagined apprehender–apprehended duality and the transformation of the cognitive basis. For Madhyamaka, it concerns the realization that neither persons nor phenomena possess intrinsic existence, without negating their dependent functionality. The accounts remain doctrinally distinct, but both resist identifying realization with the mere attainment of mental quietude or the possession of a convincing philosophical explanation.

Ethical discipline and bodhicitta remain integral to this development because the relevant ignorance is expressed not only in explicit beliefs but also in patterns of appropriation, motivation, and conduct. The maturation of wisdom must therefore affect the practitioner's ordinary engagement with experience and other beings, rather than remaining confined to formal meditation.

6. Conclusion

Yogācāra and Madhyamaka offer distinct but historically interconnected analyses of ignorance and its cessation. Yogācāra investigates the conditioned constitution of dualistic experience and the transformation of the cognitive basis through which that experience is reproduced; Madhyamaka investigates the intrinsic existence imputed to phenomena, including consciousness itself, and develops the realization of their emptiness.

Their contemplative methods cannot be adequately distinguished as experiential on one side and analytical on the other, since both employ philosophical discernment within disciplined cultivation. Yet their disagreements concerning the status of cognition and the interpretation of ultimate reality remain substantive and should not be dissolved through an assumption of doctrinal identity.

The value of their comparison lies in the complementary demands they place upon investigation: Yogācāra requires the practitioner to examine how the distinction between apprehender and apprehended becomes constituted and sustained, while Madhyamaka requires that neither pole of this distinction, nor the consciousness in which it appears, be granted intrinsic existence. Together, their historical encounter illuminates the continuing relationship between conceptual understanding, contemplative transformation, and the realization of liberating wisdom.

Selected References

Primary texts

- *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, Tattvārthapaṭala (Chapter on Reality), particularly the four investigations and their corresponding correct cognitions.
- *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*, chapter 8, especially sections 8.3–9 and 8.36. English translation: *Unraveling the Intent*, 84000: Translating the Words of the Buddha.
- Vasubandhu, *Viṃśikā*, verses 1–15 and commentary; *Triṃśikā*, verses 20–29.
- *Madhyāntavibhāga*, chapter 1.
- Nāgārjuna, *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, chapters 1 and 24.
- Candrakīrti, *Madhyamakāvatāra*, chapter 6, particularly verses 120 and 150–165.
- Bhāviveka, *Madhyamakahṛdayakārikā*, chapter 5, with *Tarkajvālā* commentary.
- Śāntarakṣita, *Madhyamakālaṃkāra*, particularly verses 92–93.
- Kamalaśīla, *Bhāvanākrama*, especially the second and third treatises.

Selected scholarly studies

- Adam, Martin T. (2006). "Two Concepts of Meditation and Three Kinds of Wisdom in Kamalaśīla's Bhāvanākramas: A Problem of Translation." *Buddhist Studies Review*, 23(1), 71–92.
- Blumenthal, James (2004). *The Ornament of the Middle Way: A Study of the Madhyamaka Thought of Śāntarakṣita*. Snow Lion.
- Deleanu, Florin (2013). "Meditative Practices in the Bodhisattvabhūmi: Quest for and Liberation through the Thing-In-Itself."
- Eckel, Malcolm David (2008). *Bhāviveka and His Buddhist Opponents*. Harvard University.
- Jones, Dhivan Thomas (2023). "Candrakīrti on the Use and Misuse of the Chariot Argument." *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 51, 453–472.