

A Geographical Perspective on Sectarian Affiliations of the *Ekottarika Āgama* in Chinese Translation (T 125)

Tse-fu Kuan

The *Ekottarika Āgama* (*Zengyi ahanjing*, T 125) extant in Chinese translation is a collection of texts which are organized by numbers mentioned in the texts. It corresponds roughly to the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* in the Theravāda tradition still flourishing today. The sectarian affiliation of the *Ekottarika Āgama* is controversial. This research is an attempt to explore this issue in a more comprehensive way. A comparison between the texts in this collection and their parallels reveals its geographical preference for Magadha. This finding, along with some textual indications, suggests that the *Ekottarika Āgama* could be affiliated to the Mahāsāṃghikas or Mūlasarvāstivādins.

Introduction

The four *Āgamas* translated into Chinese from their Indic originals in the fourth and fifth centuries AD correspond to the four main *Nikāyas* in Pali and also represent the earliest stratum of the Buddhist Canon. Widespread agreement has been reached in attributing the *Madhyama Āgama* (hereafter abbreviated as 'MĀ'; T 26 *Zhong ahanjing*) to the Sarvāstivāda school.¹ The *Samyukta Āgama* (hereafter 'SĀ', T 99 *Za ahanjing*) is also widely ascribed to the Sarvāstivāda² or perhaps more precisely the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition.³ *Bieyi Za ahanjing* (T 100),

¹ Lü 1963: 242; Kumoi 1963: 248; Mayeda 1964: 643–644; Ui 1965: 136; Enomoto 1984a: 1071; Thich Minh Chau 1991: 18–27; Oberlies 2003: 48.

² Kumoi 1963: 248; Ui 1965: 136; Yinshun 1994: 97; Hiraoka 2000: 501.

³ Lü 1963: 242; Enomoto 1984a: 1071; Enomoto 1984b: 99; Mizuno 1996: 373–375; Hiraoka 2003; Oberlies 2003: 64.

‘Other Translation of the *Samyukta Āgama*’ (hereafter ‘SĀ2’), was transmitted by the Mūlasarvāstivāda according to recent research.⁴ The *Dirgha Āgama* (hereafter ‘DĀ’, T 1 *Chang ahanjing*) is attributed to the Dharmaguptaka by many scholars.⁵

In contrast, the sectarian affiliation of the *Ekottarika Āgama* (hereafter ‘EĀ’, T 125 *Zengyi ahanjing*) is controversial. It is ascribed to the Mahāsāṃghikas by Bareau (1955a: 55 and 57), Ui (1965: 137–138), Akanuma (1981: 37–39), Bronkhorst (1985: 312–314), Pāsādika (2010: 88–90), etc., but to the Dharmaguptakas by Matsumoto (1914: 349) and Warder (2000: 6). The arguments for assigning it to the Dharmaguptaka do not seem strong. One argument is that, in the words of Warder (2000: 6), EĀ states that there are 250 *prātimokṣa* rules, a figure which among the *Vinayas* now available agrees only with that of the Dharmaguptaka (T 1428, *Four-Part Vinaya* 四分律). This argument ignores two facts: (1) the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* available today also has 250 rules;⁶ (2) the number of *prātimokṣa* rules underwent a period of fluidity as attested by the different texts of the same sects.⁷ The other argument is that the *stūpa* (pagoda) features prominently in both the EĀ (*stūpa* transcribed as *toupo* 偷婆) and the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya* (*stūpa* translated as 塔). The word *stūpa* (塔) occurs 261 times in the 60 fascicles (*juan* 卷) of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, which contains 448 pages in the Taishō edition (T XXII 567–1014).⁸ Here the frequency of the word *stūpa* is 4.35 occurrences per fascicle or 0.58 per page. In the 40 fascicles of the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* (T 1425 摩訶僧祇律), which contains 322 pages in the Taishō edition (T XXII 227–548), *stūpa* (塔) occurs 226 times.⁹ Thus the frequency of the word *stūpa* is 5.56 occurrences per fascicle or 0.70 per page. Consequently, the *stūpa* features even more prominently in the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya* than in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, and hence the Mahāsāṃghika school would be a better candidate for the affiliation of EĀ than the Dharmaguptaka.

As mentioned above, many scholars are in favour of attributing EĀ to the Mahāsāṃghikas. Their arguments, however, are not conclusive and are only based on fragmentary evidence. As Anālayo (2009: 822) points out, Bareau (1955a:

⁴Enomoto 1984a: 1073; Enomoto 1984b: 102; Bingenheimer 2011: 42–44. Cf. also Bucknell (2011).

⁵Lü, 1963: 242; Kumoi, 1963: 248; Ui, 1965: 135; Waldschmidt, 1980: 136; Salomon 1999: 173–174.

⁶Cf. Nattier & Prebish (1977: 268).

⁷Cf. Anālayo (2009: 823).

⁸By searching CBETA.

⁹By searching CBETA.

55 and 57) refers to the introductory section (i.e. Prefatory Chapter 序品) of EĀ in support of assigning it to the Mahāsāṃghika tradition, but he does not offer further specifications. Therefore, Anālayo (2009: 822–823) has conducted “a short survey of instances from this introductory section that seem relevant to the question of school affiliation”, and sums up:

Hence the reference to three past Buddhas instead of one, the injunction to freely supply a location to a discourse when this has been forgotten, the manifestation of an earthquake and heavenly flowers at the conclusion of the first council, and Ānanda’s initial hesitation to take on the role of reciting the discourses at the first council are elements in the introduction to the *Ekottarika Āgama* that would support associating it with the Mahāsāṃghika tradition.

On the other hand, Anālayo (2009: 823) goes on to comment: “... conclusions on the school affiliation of the introduction may not necessarily hold true for the whole *Āgama* collection.”

In his two articles, Hiraoka (2007, 2008) sees some passages of the EĀ as showing an affinity with certain schools, particularly the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda. As I suggested in a conference paper presented in 2010,¹⁰ only one of the instances given in his two articles provides apparently substantial evidence, and it indicates a close connection between the EĀ and the Mūlasarvāstivāda. Both the EĀ (T II 726c–727b) and the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶藥事 (T 1448 XXIV 22c–23b) have an account about the Buddha being saluted by King Ajātasattu and gods, who offered 2500 parasols in total. Both texts say that the Buddha on that occasion related a story about his former birth as King Mahāsudassana. Both texts share a fairly similar storyline. As far as I am aware, there is only one other parallel tale, which is in the *Dhammapada* Commentary (III 445–448), but this Pali version is considerably different in many details from the story in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* and EĀ. Therefore, the presence of this story in the two texts suggests the possibility that this EĀ passage is of Mūlasarvāstivāda provenance.

It may be reasonable to recognize a certain passage or even a *sūtra* in EĀ as closely related to a certain school. In a forthcoming article (Kuan 2012 or 2013), I

¹⁰“Enquiry into the Sectarian Affiliation of the *Ekottarika Āgama* in Chinese Translation”, The Fourth International Conference of Sri Lanka Association of Buddhist Studies, Kandy, Sri Lanka, December 2010.

provide three arguments for EĀ 32.5 being affiliated to the Mahāsāṃghikas. Such studies, however, can provide only fragmentary pieces of evidence at the most. Even if pieced together, they still cannot prove that the entire EĀ collection was transmitted by a certain school. My present essay is an attempt to make a more comprehensive exploration of this issue, using a method very different from the others.

Method

The narrative framework of a text (*sūtra/sutta* or others) could have been arbitrarily set up in the compilation of the Buddhist Canon, as Gombrich (1990: 22) points out: “In its account of how the Canon came to be compiled, at the First Council, the introduction to the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*¹¹ frankly says that words of the narrative portions were inserted on that occasion, and thus clearly distinguishes between the words attributed to the Buddha and their settings.” Therefore the setting of a text may not tell us the exact place at which a discourse was delivered or an event happened. From the religious point of view, the setting is irrelevant to religious practice; what really matters is the doctrine on liberation. It is therefore likely that the Buddhist tradition paid more attention to preserving the doctrine than to the settings. After the schisms, the various sects did not mind modifying some doctrines in their texts, let alone making up settings for their texts.

Schopen’s (1997) research may cast some light on this issue. He cited the following passage from the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (translated from Tibetan by Schopen 1997: 575):

The Blessed One said: “Upāli, those who forget the name of the place, etc., must declare it was one or another of the six great cities, or somewhere where the Tathāgata stayed many times. If he forgets the name of the king, he must declare it was Prasenajit; if the name of the householder, that it was Anāthapiṇḍada; of the lay-sister, that it was Mṛgāramātā.”

Schopen (1997: 575–576) says that the two categories, “places where the Buddha stayed many times” and “the six great cities”, are almost coterminous. He (p. 576) points out that the range of options among the six cities is severely restricted

¹¹Commentary on DN.

by the additional provisions. If the name of a king or householder or female lay follower is lost, it must be replaced with the names Prasenajit, Anāthapiṇḍada or Mrgāramātā, while all these three were from Śrāvastī (Pali Sāvattī). Therefore the rules set in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* quoted above clearly favour Sāvattī. Schopen (1997: 579) concludes: “The shape of all our collections would, moreover, seem to suggest that redactional rules very similar to those in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* operated in all traditions or monastic groups, even if the Mūlasarvāstivādin version is the only one so far discovered.” I would like to add that apart from the Mūlasarvāstivādin version, there are at least three other versions available to us.

1. The *Ten Recitations Vinaya* 十誦律 (T 1435) of the Sarvāstivāda records a similar conversation between the Buddha and Upālī and also lists six great cities,¹² but one of the six differs from the Mūlasarvāstivādin version and the order of the six cities is also different.¹³
2. The *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 (T 1425) lists eight great cities instead of six as the place names that should be supplied in case they are forgotten (T XXII 497a).¹⁴
3. The Prefatory Chapter of EĀ states: “If the place where a *sūtra* was delivered is lost, one should say that it was [delivered] in Sāvattī.”¹⁵

Thich Minh Chau (1991: 55) points out that more texts in the Chinese *Madhyama Āgama* than in the Pali *Majjhima Nikāya* have their settings in Kammāsadhamma, and he suggests that this is because the Sarvāstivādins preferred places related to their stronghold or their own native places. In other words, the compilers’ regional sense may have affected their selection of settings for the *sūtras*. Accordingly, we may be able to identify or speculate about the sectarian affiliation of EĀ by finding out if the compilers of this collection had an inclination for a certain region when making up the settings. This geographical inclination can be detected

¹²T XXIII 288b–c: 長老優波離問佛：「世尊，我等不知佛在何處說修多羅、毘尼、阿毘曇。我等不知云何。」佛言：「在六大城：瞻波國、舍衛國、毘舍離國、王舍城、波羅[木*奈]、迦維羅衛城。何以故？我多在彼住，種種變化皆在是處。」

¹³The Sarvāstivāda version lists Campā, Sāvattī, Vesālī, Rājagaha, Bārāṇasī and Kapilavattu (see the quotation in the previous footnote), while the Mūlasarvāstivāda version has Sāvattī, Sāketa, Vesālī, Bārāṇasī, Rājagaha and Campā (see Schopen 1997: 576).

¹⁴T XXII 497a: 如是一切聽一切制皆在八大城：一舍衛、二沙祇、三瞻婆、四波羅奈、五拘睺彌、六毘舍離、七王舍城、八迦毘羅衛。是九部經若忘說處者，是八大城趣舉一，即名是處世尊所印，是名聽法。

¹⁵T II 550b: 正使不得說經處，當稱原本在舍衛。

by comparing *sūtras* of EĀ with their parallels in other collections of Buddhist texts extant in various languages. The parallels are collected from the following two sources:

1. Chizen Akanuma, *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas*, 1929.
2. Venerable Anālayo, Rod Bucknell and Bhante Sujato, *Online Sutta Correspondence Project* (<http://www.suttacentral.net/>), 2011.

I have to concede that due to my inability to read Tibetan, the Tibetan parallels are not included in this study. This being said, there are so few Tibetan parallels that their exclusion would have very little, if any, effect on the result of my research.

Each EĀ *sūtra* and its parallel/parallels are put in the same row in the tables below for comparison. EĀ comprises 472 *sūtras* and the Prefatory Chapter 序品, which contains no *sūtra*. Of these 472 *sūtras*, 21 *sūtras* give no locations¹⁶ and 80 are set in locations other than Sāvatti City (*Shewei Guo* 舍衛國¹⁷).¹⁸ Apart from these 101 *sūtras*, 371 out of the 472 *sūtras* in EĀ are set in Sāvatti. The extraordinarily frequent occurrence of Sāvatti as the setting apparently results from the application of the above-mentioned rule stated in the Prefatory Chapter. Although this setting is virtually meaningless in most cases, if a *sūtra* set in Sāvatti has a parallel text that is set in another place, this may afford a clue for speculating about the geographical inclination of the school to which that parallel text belongs. Therefore, such cases will be included in the tabular comparison below. Place names in this paper are given mainly in their Pali forms for the practical reason that most Indic names within the scope of this study are found in Pali sources rather than in Sanskrit. The following four cases are omitted from the tables below because they are invalid for our comparative study:

¹⁶ 4. 2–10, 5.1–5, 6.1–4, 7.1–3.

¹⁷ *Guo* 國 can mean ‘country/nation’, ‘capital’ or ‘city’ (see HDC s.v. 國). In many cases, including this one, it refers to the capital and is translated as ‘city’ in my paper.

¹⁸ 11.9, 11.10, 12.6, 12.8, 13.4, 13.6, 13.7, 17.10, 17.11, 18.4, 18.5, 18.8, 19.1, 19.2, 19.9, 19.11, 20.2, 23.2, 23.3, 23.6, 23.7, 24.3, 24.5, 24.8, 25.6, 28.1, 28.3, 28.4, 30.1, 30.2, 31.2, 31.4, 31.8, 32.6, 32.7, 32.10, 33.10, 34.2, 35.7, 35.9, 37.2, 37.3, 37.10, 38.3, 38.7, 38.9, 38.11, 39.10, 40.2, 40.5, 40.7, 40.10, 41.1, 41.2, 41.4, 42.3, 43.3, 43.4, 43.6, 43.7, 44.6, 44.7, 44.9, 44.11, 45.1, 45.2, 45.4, 45.7, 46.8, 47.9, 48.5, 48.6, 49.4, 49.6, 49.8, 49.9, 50.4, 50.10, 52.1, 52.6.

1. An EĀ *sūtra* is set in Sāvatti while its parallel/parallels give no setting.
2. An EĀ *sūtra* is set in Sāvatti and has no parallels.
3. An EĀ *sūtra* and all its parallel/parallels are set in the same place.
4. An EĀ *sūtra* gives no setting.

The 13 sets of texts listed in Table 1 appear to suit our purpose, but a scrutiny reveals that this is not the case. A few sets of texts are too different from each other to be regarded as parallels. In two cases, different place names are given as the settings in the parallel texts, but by inference they actually refer to the same place. In other cases, although the parallels give different place names, these places were located in the same country. Such cases are excluded from this study, which is primarily concerned with the countries or states that were chosen as the settings of the texts. There are still other cases that are excluded. The reason for each case is given in the following table.

Table 1

EĀ <i>sūtras</i> (referred to by chapter number and <i>sūtra</i> number)	Parallels in Pali and Sanskrit	Parallels in Chinese translation
18.3 T II 587c Sāvatti 舍衛國	MN 3 (I 12) Sāvatti This was the capital of Kosala.	MĀ 88 (T I 569c) Kosala country 拘娑羅國
24.5 T II 618a27 Magadha 摩竭國 (lit. <i>Mojie</i> Country. Hereafter Magadha.)	MN 26 (MN I 160) Although the Buddha is said to live in Sāvatti at the beginning of the <i>sutta</i> , the parallel account is set in Magadha (MN I 168ff.)	
37.3 T II 710c Vajji 拔耆國	MN 32 (I 212) Gosiṅgasālavanadāya This is in Vajji according to MN 31 (see EĀ 24.8 above) Skt frgm: SHT V 1346 No location	MĀ 184 (T I 726c) Vajji 跋耆瘦 (* <i>Vajjisū</i>) T 154.16 生經·佛說比丘各言志經 (T III 80c) Vajji 越祇
38.10 T II 724b On one occasion the Buddha was in Sāvatti (T II 724b: 一時佛在舍衛國), but later the king was told: “The Sakya clan has a village called Deer Hall, where the Tathāgata is staying.” (T II 724c: 釋種有村名曰鹿堂, 如來在彼遊化)	MN 89 (II 118) Sakya AN 10.30 (V 65) Sāvatti	MA 213 (T I 795b17) among the Sakyans 釋中 T 1451.8 <i>Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Kṣudrakavastu</i> 根本說一切有部毘奈耶·雜事 (T XXIV 237a6–239b18) Sakya clan 釋種
38.11 T II 725b Rājagaha 羅閱城	Dhp-a III 436–449 Veḷuvana This was in Rājagaha according to DPPN II 936.	

EĀ <i>sūtras</i> (referred to by chapter number and <i>sūtra</i> number)	Parallels in Pali and Sanskrit	Parallels in Chinese translation
41.5 T II 746a Sāvatti 舍衛國	SN 16.5 (II 202) Rājagaha This text is too different from EĀ 41.5 to be counted as its parallel.	EA 12.6 (T II 570a) Rājagaha 羅閱城 SĀ 1141 (T II 301c) Sāvatti 舍衛國 SĀ2 116 (T II 416b) Sāvatti 舍衛國 All the three texts are too different to be counted as parallels to EĀ 41.5.
44.6 T II 766a Ukkatthā 優迦羅	MN 1 (I 1) Ukkatthā This was in Kosala; see DN I 87.	MĀ 106 (T I 596b) Sāvatti 舍衛國 This was capital of Kosala
45.2 T II 770c Sakya 釋翅	MN 67 (I 456) at Cātumā (a Sākya village according to DPPN I 860) in a myrobalan grove (<i>āmalakivana</i>)	T 137 (T II 860a) A-mo-le herb grove (<i>āmalakivana</i>) of the Sakya clan 釋氏舍夷阿摩勒藥樹園
45.4 T II 772a village of Poluo 婆羅村, which is most likely to be a misprint of 娑羅村, village of Suoluo (Sālā)	SN 4.18 (I 113) Magadha, at the brahmin village of Pañcasālā (<i>Bhagavā Magadhesu viharati Pañcasālāyam brāhmaṇagāme</i>) Dhp-a III 257-8 Pañcasālā	SĀ 1095 (T II 288a) the brahmin village of Suoluo (Sālā) 娑羅婆羅門聚落, equivalent to <i>Pañcasālāyam brāhmaṇagāme</i> , but Pañca is omitted.
49.10 T II 806a Sāvatti 舍衛國	AN 11.16 V 342 No location Skt frgm SHT I 620R Śrāvastī (Sāvatti)	T 138 (T II 861a-b) comprises two <i>sūtras</i> ; both begin with 聞如是：一時，婆伽婆在。Only the second <i>sūtra</i> , set in Sāvatti 舍衛城, is parallel to EĀ 49.10, while the first <i>sūtra</i> is set in Rājagaha 羅閱城
50.6 T II 811a Sāvatti 舍衛國	MN 12.9-15 (I 68) Vesāli Too different to be reckoned a parallel.	
51.2 T II 814b Sāvatti 舍衛國	SN 15.13 (II 187) Rājagaha The text is much longer and more elaborate, so it should not be reckoned a parallel to EĀ 51.2.	SĀ 937 (T II 240b) Vesāli 毘舍離 SĀ2 330 (T II 485c) Vesāli 毘舍離 Both texts are too much longer and elaborate to be reckoned parallels to EĀ 51.2.
52.9 T II 829b Sāvatti 舍衛國	Ja 77 (I 334) Jetavana This place is in Sāvatti as found throughout the Canon.	T 146 (T II 870c) Sāvatti 舍衛 T 147 (T II 872a) Sāvatti 舍衛國 T 148 (T II 873a) Sāvatti 舍衛國

Below are the cases valid for this study:

Table 2

EĀ sūtras	Parallels in Pali, Sanskrit and Gāndhārī	Parallels in Chinese translation
11.9 T II 567a Rājagaha 羅閱城 (Luoyue City, partial transcription of Rājagaha)		
11.10 T II 567b Rājagaha 羅閱城		
12.1 T II 568a Sāvatti 舍衛國 (more precisely Sāvatti Capital/ City, see note 17)	DN 22 (II 290) and MN 10 (I 55) are both set in Kammāsaddhamma in the Kuru country.	MĀ 98 T I 582b Kammāsaddhamma 劒磨瑟曇 in the Kuru country 拘樓瘦 (*Kurūsu)
12.6 T II 570a Rājagaha 羅閱城	SN 16.5 (II 202) Rājagaha	SĀ 1141 (T II 301c) Sāvatti 舍衛國 SĀ2 116 (T II 416b) 舊園林毘舍佉講堂. This place is in Sāvatti according to SĀ2 113 (T II 415a: 舍衛舊園林中毘舍佉講堂) EA 41.5 is too different to be counted as a parallel.
12.7 T II 570b Sāvatti 舍衛國	SN 17.36 (II 242) Rājagaha	SĀ 1064 (T II 276b) Rājagaha 王舍城 (King-house City, a literal translation of Rājagaha/ Rājagṛha) SĀ2 3 (T II 374b) Rājagaha 王舍城
12.8 T II 570c Rājagaha 羅閱城		
13.4 T II 573a 拔祇國 Vajji	SN 22.1 (III 1) Bhaggā (Bhaggesu viharati. dwelling among the Bhaggas.) DPPN II 345: “Bhaggā — The name of a tribe and a country ... The Bhagga country lay between Vesāli and Sāvatti.”	SĀ 107 (T II 33a) Bhaggā (婆祇國) 婆祇 is transcribed from a name equivalent to Bhaggā according to Akanuma (1931: 90)
13.5 T II 573c Sāvatti 舍衛國	MN 7 (I 36) Sāvatti	MĀ 93 (T I 575a) 鬱鞞羅, transcribed from Uruvelā according to Akanuma (1931: 717). Uruvelā is in the Magadha country according to MN 26(I 166) T 51 梵志計水淨經 (T I 843c) Uruvelā 鬱鞞羅
13.7 T II 575a Rājagaha 羅閱城		

EĀ <i>sūtras</i>	Parallels in Pali, Sanskrit and Gāndhāri	Parallels in Chinese translation
17.10 T II 585c Sakya 釋翅		
17.11 T II 586c Rājagaha 羅閱城	AN 4.70 (II 74) No location Cv 7.3.4 (Vin II 190) Rājagaha	EĀ2 14 (T II 878a6–22) Sāvattthi 舍衛國
18.4 T II 589a Rājagaha 羅閱城		
18.8 T II 592c Sakya 釋翅瘦 (* <i>Sakkesu</i>)		
19.3 T II 593c Sāvattthi 舍衛國	MN 37 (I 251) Sāvattthi	SĀ 505 (T II 133b) Rājagaha 王舍城
19.9 T II 595b 婆那國, transcribed from Varaṇa , a country lying to the west of Sāvattthi, according to Akanuma (1931: 737)	AN 2.4.7 (I 67) Madhurā	SĀ 547 (T II 141b) 婆羅那, transcribed from Varaṇa according to Akanuma (1931: 352)
19.11 T II 596a The Buddha travelled in the territory of Magadha , and gradually approached Vesāli city. (佛遊摩竭國界, 漸來至毘舍離城)	DN 16.2.14–19 (II 95–98) Vesāli It was the capital of the Licchavis, who formed a part of the Vajjian confederacy (See DPPN II 940 s.v. Vesāli and 779 s.v. Licchavi). Mv VI.30 (Vin I 231–233) The Buddha was in Koṭigāma and then went to Vesāli at the invitation of Ambapālī. According to SN 56.21 V 431, Koṭigāma was a village of the Vajjians.	
20.2 T II 597a Rājagaha 羅閱城		
21.1 T II 601c27 Sāvattthi 舍衛國	AN 4.34 (II 34) No location It 90 (p. 87) No location	SĀ 902–904 (T II 225c) All 3 <i>sūtras</i> are set in Rājagaha 王舍城.
21.5 T II 603b Sāvattthi 舍衛國	AN 10.89 (V 170) No location SN 6.1.10 (I 149) Sāvattthi Snp III 10 (p. 123) Sāvattthi	SĀ 1278 (T II 351b) Rājagaha 王舍城 SĀ2 276 (T II 470a) Rājagaha 王舍城
23.2 T II 611c02 Rājagaha 羅閱城		
23.3 T II 612a The Buddha was in Campā City (占波國). Campā was in the country of Aṅga according to DN II 235.	AN 6.55 (III 374) in Sītavana, Rājagaha Mv V.1.12–19 (Vin I 181–183) Sītavana Waldschmidt 1968b. No location	MĀ 123 (T I 611c) Sāvattthi 舍衛國 SĀ 254 (T II 62) Rājagaha 王舍城 T 1421.21 <i>Five-Part Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka school</i> 彌沙塞部五分律 (T XXII 145a13–146b7) Rājagaha 王舍城 T 1428.39 <i>Four-Part Vinaya</i> 四分律 of the Dharmaguptakas (T XXII 843b12–845a28) Rājagaha 王舍城

EĀ sūtras	Parallels in Pali, Sanskrit and Gandhāri	Parallels in Chinese translation
23.5 T II 613b Sāvatthi 舍衛國	AN 3.79 (I 225) No location Waldschmidt 1968a. Śrāvastī (Sāvatthi)	SĀ 1073 (T II 278c) Sāvatthi 舍衛國 SĀ2 12 (T II 376c) Rājagaha 王舍城 T 116 (T II 507b) Sāvatthi 舍衛國 T 117 (T II 508a) Sāvatthi 舍衛國
23.6 T II 613c Rājagaha 羅閱城		
24.2 T II 615b Sāvatthi 舍衛國 Although the Buddha is said to be in Sāvatthi at the beginning of the sūtra, how the Buddha interacts with the demon is actually set in Vajji country. (T II 615b: 佛在舍衛國 ... 拔祇國界有鬼 ...)	SN 10.12 (I 213) = Snp I 10 (p. 31) “The Blessed One was dwelling at Āḷavī in the haunt of the demon (<i>yakkha</i>).” DPPN I 295: “Āḷavī – A town thirty yojanas from Sāvatthi and probably twelve from Benares. (SnA I 220) It lay between Sāvatthi and Rājagaha. (inferred from Vin II 170–5) ... The king of Āḷavī was known as Āḷavaka.” Accordingly, Āḷavī was a kingdom between Kosala and Magadha.	SĀ 1326 (T II 364b) Magadha 摩竭提 SĀ2 325 (T II 482c) Magadha 摩竭提
24.3 T II 617a14 Sakya 釋翅		
24.8 T II 626b The Buddha was in Kosambī City (拘深城), where the monks were in constant dispute and did evil (T II 626b: 佛在拘深城 ... 拘深比丘恒好鬪訟, 犯諸惡行). He tried to settle the dispute by giving a discourse, including a story about King Long-life (長壽王, Dighiti in Mv X.2.2–4.5). Being unable to persuade them, the Buddha left for the country of Vajji (跋耆國). There three clansmen, namely Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila, were living in concord and practising the Dharma diligently. (T II 629a: 世尊便捨而去, 詣跋耆國。爾時, 跋耆國中有三族姓子: 阿那律、難提、金毘羅。)	MN 31 (I 205) The Buddha was in Nādikā. Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila were living in concord at Gosīṅgasālavanadāya and practised the Dharma diligently. Then the spirit (<i>yakkha</i>) Dīgha Parajana and other gods praised: “It is a gain for the people of Vajji. ...” The Buddha replied without mentioning the passage on Magadha that occurs in the EĀ version. (MN I 210f.) MN 48 (I 320) The Buddha was living in Kosambī (in the country of Vamsā, see below in the right column), where the monks took to quarrelling. He summoned the monks and delivered a discourse, with which they were satisfied.	MĀ 72 (T I 532c) The Buddha dwelt in Kosambī (拘舍彌), where the monks were often quarrelling (T I 532c: 佛遊拘舍彌 ... 拘舍彌諸比丘數共鬪諍。). The Buddha tried to settle the dispute by giving a discourse, including a story about King Long-life (長壽王). Being unable to persuade them, the Buddha left Kosambī and went to Pācīnavamsadāya (般那蔓闍寺林), where lived three clansmen: Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila. (T I 536a: 般那蔓闍寺林有三族姓子共在中住, 尊者阿那律陀、尊者難提、尊者金毘羅。) The ensuing account is similar to that in MN 128 without mention of the praise for the three clansmen by Dīgha Parajana or others.

The great general Long-life (長壽大將, equivalent to Dīgha Parajana in MN 31) approached the Buddha and said: “It is a great gain for the big country of Vajjī that here dwell these three clansmen: Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila.” The Buddha replied: “... Let alone the big country of Vajjī, it is a great gain for the big country of Magadha that it has these three clansmen. If the people and the like in the big country of Magadha recollect the three clansmen, then they will enjoy peace for a long time.” (T II 629c12: 長壽大將至世尊所...白世尊曰:「跋耆大國快得大利,有此三族姓子而自遊化:阿那律、難提、金毘羅。」世尊告曰:「...且捨跋耆大國,摩竭大國快得善利,乃有此三族姓子。若當摩竭大國人民之類憶此三族姓子,便長夜獲安隱。」)	MN 128 (III 152) The opening of this <i>sutta</i> is the same as that of MN 48, about the dispute among the monks in Kosambī. Having tried to settle the dispute in vain, the Buddha went to Pācīnavamsadāya (in the Ceti country according to AN IV 228f.) and visited the above three clansmen, with whom he talked mainly on meditation. There is no mention of the praise for the three clansmen by Dīgha Parajana or others. Ja 371 (III 211) Jetavana Ja 428 (III 486) Kosambī Neither of the <i>Jātakas</i> mentions the praise for the three clansmen. Mv X. 2.2-4.5 (Vin I 341–352) does not mention the location of the dispute or the praise for the three clansmen.	T 1428 <i>Four-Part Vinaya</i> 四分律 of the Dharmaguptakas (T XXII 879b–882c): The Buddha was living in <i>Kosambī</i> (拘睢彌), where the monks were deep in dispute. The Buddha tried to settle the dispute by giving a discourse, including a story about King Long-life (長生王). Being unable to persuade the monks in Kosambī, the Buddha returned to Sāvattī. This account makes no mention of the three clansmen or the praise for them. #Kosambī was the capital of Vamsā. See DPPN II 798.
25.6 T II 632a Rājagaha 羅閱城	MN 5 (I 24) Sāvattī	MĀ 87 (T I 566a) 婆奇瘦 T 49 (T I 839a) 婆祇 Both 婆奇瘦 and 婆祇 are transcribed from a name equivalent to Bhaggā according to Akanuma (1931: 90)
26.10 T II 642b Sāvattī 舍衛國	SN 22.87 (III 119) Rājagaha	SĀ 1265 (T II 346b) Rājagaha 王舍城
27.1 T II 643a Sāvattī 舍衛國	MN 141 (III 248) Bārāṇasī (capital of Kāśi; see DPPN II 274)	MĀ 31 (T I 467a) Sāvattī 舍衛國 T 32 佛說四諦經 (T I 814b) Sāvattī 舍衛國
27.2 T II 643c Sāvattī 舍衛國	MN 11 (I 63) Sāvattī	MĀ 103 (T I 590b) Kuru 拘樓瘦 (*<i>Kurūsu</i>)
28.1 T II 646c Rājagaha 羅閱城	Dhp-a I 366–374 Sāvattī	
28.4 T II 650c Rājagaha 羅閱城	<i>Theragāthā</i> Commentary on verses 181 and 182 (I 305ff.) Sāvattī	
28.5 T II 652b Sāvattī 舍衛國	AN 4.180 (II 167) Bhoganagara DN16.4.7-11 (II 123) Bhoganagara DPPN II 393: Bhogagāmanagara — A village in the Vajjī country.	DA 2 (T I 17b) Bhoga City (負彌城) = Bhoganagara 負彌 is transcribed from Bhoga according to Akanuma (1931: 97)

EĀ sūtras	Parallels in Pali, Sanskrit and Gandhāri	Parallels in Chinese translation
30.1 T II 659a Magadha 摩竭國		
30.2 T II 659b Rājagaha 羅閱城		
31.2 T II 665b Kosambi 拘深		
31.4 T II 668b Rājagaha 羅閱城		T 131 婆羅門避死經 (T II 854b) Sāvattthi 舍衛城
31.6 T II 669c Sāvattthi 舍衛國 Only this version has the following passage: The near shore is the territory of Ajātasattu; the further shore is the territory of King Bimbisāra. (T II 670a: 此岸者阿闍世國界也，彼岸者毘沙王國界也。) Both were kings of Magadha. Ajātasattu overthrew his father, Bimbisāra, and succeeded to the throne. See Vin II 191. (阿闍世 is a usual transcription of Ajātasattu. 毘沙 is transcribed from Bimbisāra according to Hirakawa 1997: 697 and Akanuma 1931: 99).	SN 35.197 (IV 172) No location (According to Feer 1894: 172, note 9, the setting as Sāvattthi is given in only one Burmese manuscript.) Skt frgm: Enomoto 1985: 83–84 No location	SĀ 1172 (T II 313b) Kosambī 拘睺彌國
31.11 T II 673b Sāvattthi 舍衛國	SN 16.6 (II 203) Rājagaha	SĀ 1138 (T II 300b) Sāvattthi 舍衛國 SĀ2 113 (T II 415a) Sāvattthi 舍衛國
32.5 T II 676b Sāvattthi 舍衛國	SN 8.7 (I 190) Sāvattthi Hoernle 1916: 38–39 No location Enomoto 1985: 88 = SHT V 1193 No location SHT VI 1598 No location	SĀ 1212 (T II 330a) Rājagaha 王舍城 SĀ2 228 (T II 457a) Rājagaha 王舍城 MĀ 121 (T I 610a) Rājagaha 王舍城 T 61 佛說受新歲經 (T I 858a) = EĀ 32.5 T 63 佛說解夏經 (T I 861b) Rājagaha 王舍城 T 62 佛說新歲經 (T I 859a) Sāvattthi 舍衛國 This text is very different from the others and is a Mahāyānist variant.
32.6 T II 669c Rājagaha 羅閱城		
33.10 T II 689a04 Magadha 摩竭國	AN 7.68 (IV 128) Kosala	MĀ 5 (T I 425a15) Kosala 拘薩羅

EĀ sūtras	Parallels in Pali, Sanskrit and Gāndhārī	Parallels in Chinese translation
34.2 T II 690a13 Bārāṇasī 波羅[木*奈]	Dhp-a I 337–361. [Sāvatthi] This reference should not be counted because it is much longer than EĀ 34.2, and has a prologue different from the EĀ version.	T 197 佛說興起行經·佛說頭痛宿緣經第三 (T IV 166c) [Anotatta Lake 阿耨大泉] T 198 佛說義足經·維樓勒王經第十六 (T IV 188a) [Sāvatthi 舍衛國] T 211 法句譬喻經 (T IV 583a) [No location] These three texts should not be counted because they each correspond to only a small part of EĀ 34.2 without any account similar to the prologue of EĀ 34.2.
35.7 T II 699c Rājagaha 羅閱城	SN 7.2.3 (I 174–175) Sāvatthi (in Kosala) Dhp-a III 232–233, which is an abridged version of SN 7.2.3.	SĀ 1181 (T II 319b) Kosala 拘薩羅 SĀ 295 (T II 407b) Kosala 拘薩羅
35.9 T II 701a Rājagaha 羅閱城	SN 8.4 (I 188) Sāvatthi	SĀ 1214 (T II 331a) Sāvatthi 舍衛國 SĀ 230 (T II 458a) Sāvatthi 舍衛國
37.2 T II 708c Anotatta Lake 阿耨達泉		T 310 大寶積經·密迹金剛力士會 (T XI 56c) This should not be counted because it is in a Mahāyāna text and resembles only part of the second half of EĀ 37.2.
37.7 T II 713c Sāvatthi 舍衛國		SĀ 335 (T II 92c) Kuru 拘留搜 (*Kurūsu)
38.3 T II 717c Magadha 摩竭國	AN 4.36 (II 37) <i>antarā ca Ukkatṭham antarā ca Setabyarī</i> (both in Kosala, for Ukkatṭhā see DN I 87, for Setabya see DN II 316) Gāndhārī version: Allon 2001: 124 -hofo (incomplete)	SĀ 101 (T II 28a) Kosala 拘薩羅 SĀ 267 (T II 467a) Kosala Country 憍薩羅國
38.6 T II 719b Sāvatthi 舍衛國	MN 86 (II 97) Sāvatthi Skt frgm: Enomoto 1994: 22–23 No location Hartmann 1998: 358–361 Restore to (<i>Magadheṣu</i> or <i>Māgadakeṣu janapa</i>)deṣu according to T 100, i.e. SĀ 2 16 (see Hartmann 1998: 358)	SĀ 1077 (T II 280c) Aṅguttarāpa 央瞿多羅國 SĀ 2 16 (T II 378b) Magadha 摩竭陀國 T 118 佛說鶡掘摩 (T II 508b) Sāvatthi 舍衛國

KUAN – SECTARIAN AFFILIATIONS OF THE EKOTTARIKA ĀGAMA

	SHT I 160c No location SHT VI 1561 No location	T 119 佛說鳶嶠髻經 (T II 510b) Sāvatthi 舍衛城 T 200.99 賢愚經·無惱指鬘品 (T IV 423b) Sāvatthi 舍衛國 T 212.17 出曜經·雜品 (T IV 703a) Sāvatthi 舍衛國
38.8 T II 723c Sāvatthi 舍衛國	SN 35.206 (IV 198) No location	SĀ 1171 (T II 313a) Kosambi 拘睢彌
38.9 T II 724a Bārāṇasī 波羅[木*奈]		
39.6 T II 731a Sāvatthi 舍衛國	SN 46.16 (V 81) Rājagaha	
39.9 T II 733b Sāvatthi 舍衛國	MN 23 (I 142) Sāvatthi	SĀ 1079 (T II 282a) Rājagaha 王舍城 SĀ2 18 (T II 379c) Rājagaha 王舍城 T 95 (T I 918b) No location
40.1 T II 735b Sāvatthi 舍衛國	DN 27 (III 80) Sāvatthi AN 7.62 (IV 100) Vesāli Skt frgm: SHT V 1583 No location Waldschmidt 1970 No location	MĀ 8 (T I 428c) Vesāli 鞞舍離 MĀ 154 (T I 673b) Sāvatthi 舍衛國 DĀ 5 (T I 36b) Sāvatthi 舍衛國 T 10 (T I 216b) Sāvatthi 舍衛國 T 30 (T I 811c) Vesāli 毘舍梨
40.5 T II 739b Vesāli 毘舍離		
40.6 T II 740a Sāvatthi 舍衛國	MN 2 (I 6) Sāvatthi AN 6.58 (III 387) No location	MĀ 10 (T I 431c) Kuru 拘樓瘦 (*Kurūsu) T 31 (T I 813a) Kuru Country 拘留國
40.7 T II 741b Ayojjhā 阿踰闍 It is uncertain in which country Ayojjhā was located (see DPPN I 165).		MĀ 7 T I 427c Kosambi 拘舍彌
40.8 T II 741c Sāvatthi 舍衛國	AN 6.19 (III 303) Nāḍika (in the Vajji country according to DPPN I 976) AN 8.73 (IV 316) Nāṭika/ Nātika/ Nāḍika	

EĀ sūtras	Parallels in Pali, Sanskrit and Gandhāri	Parallels in Chinese translation
41.2 T II 744c Deer Park City 鹿野城 (probably Migadāya, near Bārāṇasī, which was the capital of Kāśi)		
42.5 T II 753c Sāvattthi 舍衛國	AN 8.70 (IV 308) DN 16.3.1–20 (II 102–109) Sanskrit: Divy 200–206 All these 3 parallels are set in Cāpāla shrine in Vesālī. Akanuma (1929: 387) lists SN 51.10 and <i>Udāna</i> 6.1 (set in Cāpāla shrine) as parallels, but they make no mention of the eight causes for a great earthquake, the purport of EĀ 42.5, so they should not be counted.	DĀ 2 (T I 15c– 16a) Cāpāla shrine 遮婆羅塔 It is in Vesālī according to the Pali and Divy versions. MĀ 36 (T I 477b) 金剛國, Diamond Country, could be Vajirā (see DPPN II 810)
42.6 T II 754a Anuruddha dwelled at the place where four Buddhas lived. The Blessed One was in Sāvattthi. 阿那律遊在四佛所居處。世尊在舍衛城。	AN 8.30 (IV 228) The Blessed One dwelled among the Bhaggas (Bhaggā country). Anuruddha dwelled among the Ceti (Ceti country). (<i>Bhagavā Bhaggesu viharati. Anuruddho Cetisu viharati.</i>) Ceti is among the 16 great countries (<i>mahājanapada</i>) in AN I 212–213.	MĀ 74 (T I 540c18) The Buddha dwelled in Bhaggā (* <i>Bhaggesu</i>). Anuruddha was in Ceti (* <i>Cetisu</i>). 佛遊婆奇瘦。阿那律陀在枝提瘦 T 46 (T I 835c) The Buddha was on Mount Shizhi/Shimu (?) ... Anuruddha was in that <i>Jhāna Open Water</i> (?) 佛在誓[枝]牧山 ... 阿那律，在彼禪空澤中。
43.3 T II 758c territory of Magadha 摩竭國界	SN 35.200 (IV 179) Ayojjhā The setting is “The Buddha was dwelling at Kosambi / Ayojjhā on the bank of the river Ganges”. The town’s name has different readings: <i>Kosambiyam</i> and <i>Ayojjhāyam</i> . DPPN I 165 states: “Kosambi was on the bank of the river Jumnā rather than the Ganges.” The map of Zürcher (1962: 2–3) also locates Kosambi by the river Yamuna, which is synonymous with Jumnā (see Lamotte 1988: MAP 1). According to another <i>sutta</i> (SN III 140), Ayojjhā was on the bank of the river Ganges.	SĀ 1174 (T II 314c) Ayojjhā 阿毘闍, which is transcribed from a name equivalent to Ayojjhā according to Akanuma (1931: 68).

	Consequently the correct reading in our text must be <i>Ayojjhāyam</i> . It is, however, uncertain in which country Ayojjhā was located (see DPPN I 165).	
43.6 T II 761b Magadha 摩竭國	MN 34 (I 225) Vajji Skt frgm: SHT VI 1381 (unknown school affiliation) Rājagrha (Rājagaha)	SĀ 1248 (T II 342a) Rājagaha 王舍城
44.7 T II 766b Rājagaha 羅閱城	Dhp-a I 319 Sāvatthi	
44.9 T II 767c Rājagaha 羅閱城		
44.10 T II 768c Sāvatthi 舍衛國	SN 45.2 (V 2) Sakya	
44.11 T II 769a Rājagaha 羅閱城	AN 9.24 (IV 401) No location	
45.1 T II 769b Rājagaha 羅閱城 Found in the prologue (T II 769b12–c21).	Ja 196 (II 127) Jetavana The beginning is somewhat different from the prologue of EĀ 45.1 Sanskrit texts: Mhvu III 67–90. Divy 523.9–528.13 Neither has a counterpart to the prologue of EĀ 45.1	MĀ 136 (T I 642a) Sāvatthi 舍衛國 It has no counterpart to the prologue of EĀ 45.1. T 1442 <i>Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya</i> 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 (T XXIII 887a–891c) A preceding passage (886a19–887a3) may be reckoned a counterpart to the prologue of EĀ 45.1, but it gives no location .
45.5 T II 772c Sāvatthi 舍衛國	SN 11.22 (I 237) Sāvatthi	SĀ 1107 (T II 291a) Vesāli 鞞舍離 SĀ2 36 (T II 385a) Sāvatthi 舍衛國
45.6 T II 773b Sāvatthi 舍衛國	MN 151 (III 293) Rājagaha	SĀ 236 (T II 57b) Sāvatthi 舍衛國
45.7 T II 773c Rājagaha 羅閱城	Dhp-a I 434–447 Jetavana	
46.2 T II 775c Sāvatthi 舍衛國	AN 10.20 (V 29) in Kuru country, in a town called Kammāsadhamma	
46.8 T II 778b Rājagaha 羅閱城	AN 10.27 (V 48) Sāvatthi	
47.9 T II 784a Rājagaha 羅閱城		

EĀ sūtras	Parallels in Pali, Sanskrit and Gāndhārī	Parallels in Chinese translation
48.2 T II 786a Sāvatti 舍衛國	AN 8.20 (IV 204) Sāvatti According to Akanuma (1929: 152), the second half of EĀ 48.2 is equivalent to Dhp-a III 236, which in my view is too different to be counted as a parallel.	MĀ 37 (T I 478b) Campā 瞻波 T 33 恒水經 (T I 817a) the river Ganges 恒水 T 34 法海經 (T I 818a) Campā 瞻波 T 35 海八德經 (T I 819a) 無勝國, unidentified place T 1421.28 <i>Five-Part Vinaya of the Mahiśāsaka school</i> 彌沙塞部五分律 (T XXII 180c25-181b4) Campā Country 瞻婆國 T 1435.33 <i>Ten Recitations Vinaya</i> 十誦律 of the Sarvāstivāda (T XXIII 239b7-240a27) Campā Country 瞻婆國
48.5 T II 791c Rājagaha 羅閱城		
49.3 T II 795b Sāvatti 舍衛國	SN 14.15 (II 155) Rājagaha	SĀ 447 (T II 115a) Rājagaha 王舍城
49.4 T II 796a 拘留沙法行城 Kammasadhamma, Kuru 拘留沙 (*Kurūsu) is transcribed from Kuru according to Akanuma (1931: 330). 法行城 (Dharma Action City) is translated from Kammasadhamma according to Akanuma (1931: 270).		
49.6 T II 798a Rājagaha 羅閱城	MN 92 (II 146) =Snp III 7 (p. 102) at Āpaṇa in the country of Āṅguttarāpa Sanskrit text: Dutt 1984: 262–266 (in the <i>Bhaiṣajyavastu</i> of <i>Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayavastu</i>) Location is referred to as Udumā on p. 255. Here Dutt (note 3) suggests that it is equivalent to Ātumā in Mv VI. 37 (Vin I 249f.), according to which this town lay between Kusināra and Sāvatti. Therefore it was probably located in or near Kosala Country .	T 1428.42 <i>Four-Part Vinaya</i> 四分律 of the Dharmaguptakas (T XXII 873a25–c12) Āṅguttarāpa Country 阿牟多羅國, Āpaṇa City 阿摩那城

EĀ <i>sūtras</i>	Parallels in Pali, Sanskrit and Gāndhārī	Parallels in Chinese translation
49.9 T II 802b Sakya 釋翅	Akanuma (1929: 153) refers to Cv 7.3-4 & Dhp-a I 133, but both accounts are too different to be reckoned parallels to EĀ 49.9.	
50.4 T II 806c Magadha Country, Mithilā City 摩竭國蜜提羅城	MN 83 (II 74) Mithilā (in Videha Country according to DN II 235) Ja 9 (I 137) and Ja 541 (VI 95) are both set at Mithilā in the country of Videha (<i>Videharatṭhe Mithilāyaṃ</i>)	MĀ 67 (T I 511c) Videha Country... Mithilā 鞞陀提國 ... 彌薩羅 T 152.87 六度集經·摩調王經 (T III 48b) 無夷國, which refers to Mithilā according to Akanuma (1931: 426). T 211.38 法句譬喻經·道利品 (T IV 606b) [No location] Too different to be reckoned a parallel.
50.10 T II 813c Rājagaha 羅閱城		

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 2 lists all EĀ *sūtras* that are valid for our comparative study: a total of 82 EĀ *sūtras* either have no parallels or have parallels that are set at locations different from those in EĀ *sūtras*. Of these 82 *sūtras*, 31 are set in Sāvattthi. This frequency is not surprising because, as mentioned above, it is an “authorized” practice to assume Sāvattthi as the setting for those *sūtras* whose settings were unavailable. What should really surprise us is the remarkable frequency of place names related to the kingdom of Magadha. 28 *sūtras* are set in Rājagaha, the capital of Magadha. 7 *sūtras* are set in Magadha. Although EĀ 24.8 and EĀ 31.6 begin by stating locations irrelevant to Magadha, they both contain passages referring to Magadha, but such passages are not found in their parallel texts. In sum, 37 *sūtras* out of the 82 *sūtras* in question (45%) refer to Magadha or its capital. This is a statistically significant indication that the school which transmitted EĀ (T 125) had a strong preference for Magadha.

In striking contrast, of the 72 Pali parallels,¹⁹ only 9 (12.5%) are set in Rājagaha; no others are set in this city or other places in Magadha. Among the 19 Sarvāstivāda parallels (18 MĀ *sūtras* and one parallel in the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*), only 2 (10.5%) are set in Magadha: one in Rājagaha and the other in Uruvelā.

¹⁹SN 10.12 and Snp I 10 are regarded as one and the same parallel to EĀ 24.2. MN 92 and Snp III 7 are regarded as one and the same parallel to EĀ 49.6.

In Table 2 there are 26 occurrences of SĀ *sūtras*, of which 11 (42%) are set in Magadha or its capital, Rājagaha. Similarly, 7 out of the 13 SĀ2 *sūtras* (54%) in this table are set in Magadha or Rājagaha. Both SĀ and SĀ2 are ascribed to the Mūlasarvāstivāda. If we also take into account the three EĀ parallels found in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*: the parallel to EĀ 38.10 set in Sakya, the parallel to EĀ 45.1 without location (hence invalid) and the parallel to EĀ 49.6 set in Udumā (near or in Kosala), then we have 41 (26 + 13 + 2) “valid” Mūlasarvāstivāda parallels in total. Thus 18 (11 + 7 + 0) out of the 41 Mūlasarvāstivāda parallels (44%) are set in Magadha or its capital. Therefore this school seems to have preferred to choose Magadha as the setting for their texts. Is it then possible that EĀ, also in favour of Magadha, belongs to the Mūlasarvāstivādins?

Let us examine the historical and geographical backgrounds of Buddhist sects in relation to Magadha. The Theravāda,²⁰ Sarvāstivāda²¹ and Mahāsāṃghika²² traditions all agree that the original schism occurred between the Sthaviras and the Mahāsāṃghikas, and that this schism occurred about one hundred years after the Buddha’s death. More precisely speaking, the schism began during the reign of Aśoka, around 270–230 BC.²³ After a survey of the Pali, Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan sources and referring to Przyluski (1926: 308–309), Dutt (1978: 10) concludes that after the first schism the Easterners, who had their seat at Vaiśālī (Vesālī), were the Mahāsāṃghikas and their offshoots; when the political as well as Buddhist centre shifted from Rājagṛha to Pāṭaliputra, the Mahāsāṃghikas also made Pāṭaliputra (Pāṭaliputta) their chief centre.²⁴ It should be noted that these two towns both belonged to “Greater Magadha”.²⁵ Pāṭaliputta, formerly a village called Pāṭaligāma, was already in the country of Magadha at the Buddha’s time (DPPN II 178). Vesālī was originally in the country of Vajjī, which was conquered by Ajātasattu, King of Magadha, soon after the Buddha’s death (DPPN II

²⁰Dīp V 16ff. (p. 35f.).

²¹*Bu Zhiyi Lun* 部執異論 (T 2033 XLIX 20a).

²²*Shelifu wen jing* 舍利弗問經 (**Sāriputraparipṛcchā*, T 1465 XXIV 900b–c).

²³For details, see Kuan (2008: 2).

²⁴Dutt makes this comment but does not provide a textual reference to support it. As to this issue, Cv XII (Vin V 294–307) in conjunction with Dīp V 16–39 (pp. 35–37) may connect the Mahāsāṃghikas to Vesālī. This school is connected to Pāṭaliputta in the **Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā* (阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 T 1545 XXVII 511a–512a). In a personal communication from Mr L.S. Cousins, he advises that one should be very cautious about interpreting any specific references to the Mahāsāṃghikas either in Pāṭaliputta or at Rājagaha or other pilgrimage sites.

²⁵I am borrowing this term from the title of Johannes Bronkhorst’s book, *Greater Magadha: Studies in the Culture of Early India*, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.

814). In other words, Vesāli was already part of Magadha when the initial schism brought the Mahāsāṃghikas into being. Bareau (1955b: ix, 108) refers to the *Sanlun xuanyi* 三論玄義 (T 1852, pp. 8b–9c)²⁶ by Jizang 吉藏 (549–623 AD), sub-commentary on the commentary by Paramārtha 真諦 (499–569 AD) on the treatise by Vasumitra (T 2033, *Bu Zhiyi Lun* 部執異論), and says:

Paramārtha has passed on to us some data that this tradition²⁷ has overlooked, such as the exile of the Mahāsāṃghikas to the north of Rājagṛha, data that seem to me credible enough to make me think that he has based them on other sources that are also worthy of attention.²⁸

Rājagṛha (Rājagaha) was the capital of Magadha at the Buddha's time.²⁹ Accordingly, the Mahāsāṃghikas had their stronghold in Magadha at a very early time.

Moreover, the prevalence of the Mahāsāṃghikas in Magadha lasted for several centuries. While interpreting the epigraphic finds in light of the literary sources, Lamotte (1988: 527) remarks: “Even while maintaining most of their strength in Magadha until the time of I ching³⁰ (end of the seventh century), the Mahāsāṃghikas, during their long history, had already migrated to Mathurā...” In the 5th century AD Faxian 法顯 stated in his autobiography that he was searching for a *Vinaya* text but the *Vinaya* was handed down orally in northern India and he could only find a written text in “Central India” at Pāṭaliputra, namely

²⁶It is stated thus: “At that time (116 years after the Buddha's death) due to Mahādeva the Mahāsāṃghikas migrated and lived in the country of *Āṅguttarāpa, which lies to the north of Rājagṛha.” (T XLV 8c: 于時大眾部因摩訶提婆移度住央崛多羅國，此國在王舍城北。)

²⁷This refers back to the Kashmiri Sarvāstivādins.

²⁸I am grateful to Dr Roderick Bucknell for translating this passage into English for me.

²⁹One of the referees says:

“It is known that the Mahāsāṃghikas were strong in Vaiśālī and Pāṭaliputra, however nothing really connects them to in Rājagṛha where presumably more than one group was active. To make that connection the author might mention that a group called the Rājagirikas was active in Andhra. They are considered to be a Mahāsāṃghikas offshoot. They are mentioned in several texts and the name appears on inscriptions (consulting the index in Lamotte *History of Indian Buddhism* will give a first range of sources).”

This comment seems to suggest that the Rājagirikas had some connection to Rājagṛha (perhaps originating in that city), but I have consulted several sources without being able to find such a connection.

³⁰義淨 is now usually transcribed as Yijing.

the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya*.³¹ Roth (1970: III) observes: “We see that the history of the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya* and of its manuscript is closely connected with ancient Pāṭaliputra which gave a home to the ‘Great Assembly.’” He (1970: X) further maintains:

Fa-hsien’s discovery of the Mā-Vin at Pāṭaliputra was certainly not an incident of mere chance. The existence of this *Vinaya* here indicates at least that the Mahāsāṃghika had one of their centers in Pāṭaliputra.

In view of the foregoing, we may tentatively conclude that the Mahāsāṃghikas were flourishing in Magadha since the first schism in the 3rd century BC until at least the 5th century AD, when Faxian acquired this school’s *Vinaya* in Pāṭaliputra. This period coincided with the transmission of EĀ (T 125) in India before it was first translated into Chinese in 385 AD by Zhu Fonian (竺佛念) and later on revised and enlarged by the same translator.³² Furthermore, the Mahāsāṃghikas’ thriving in Magadha during those centuries may explain why the redactors of EĀ exhibited a remarkable preference for Magadha when selecting place names as the settings of *sūtras*. Consequently, there is a high possibility that EĀ is affiliated to the Mahāsāṃghikas.

Let us move on to the other possibility. Willemen *et al* (1998: 85) point out that the name “Mūlasarvāstivādins” is missing in all lists anterior to the 7th century AD, and it is Yijing 義淨 who first mentions them in the last quarter of the 7th century.³³ As indicated by Willemen *et al* (1998: 85), according to Yijing, the Mūlasarvāstivādins were the most numerous Buddhist sect in Magadha.³⁴ This

³¹See T 2085 *Faxian zhuan* 法顯傳 at T LI 864b: 從彼波羅[木*奈]國東行還到巴連弗邑。法顯本求戒律，而北天竺諸國，皆師師口傳，無本可寫。是以遠涉乃至中天竺，於此摩訶衍僧伽藍得一部律，是摩訶僧祇眾律。

³²For a reconstruction of the history of its translation, see Lin (2009). The EĀ is wrongly attributed to Gautama Saṃghadeva (瞿曇僧伽提婆) in the later catalogues and Taishō edition. Cf. Legittimo (2008: 255–256) and Nattier (2010: 233, note 8).

³³See also Frauwallner (1956: 25) and Enomoto (2000: 242).

³⁴See T 2125 LIV 205b: 摩揭陀則四部通習，有部最盛。In his *Nanhai jigui neifazhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳 (T 2125), Yijing depicts the geographical distribution of the four major Buddhist schools prevailing in India at that time. These four schools are the Mahāsāṃghika, the Sthavira, the Mūlasarvāstivāda, and the Saṃmatīya (T LIV 205). In this work he sometimes refers to the Mūlasarvāstivāda as *Youbu* 有部, which was usually used by others as an abbreviation for the Sarvāstivāda (說一切有部). This has led Enomoto (2000: 243) to think that Yijing identifies the Mūlasarvāstivāda as the Sarvāstivāda. It should be noted, however, that Yijing unequivocally says: “The *Ten Recitations Vinaya* too (like the Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka and Kāśyapiya) is not of the

was the situation in Magadha over 200 years after EĀ, SĀ and SĀ2³⁵ had been translated, and hence does not suffice to explain why the redactors of these *Āgamas* preferred to choose places in Magadha as the settings of *sūtras*. There arises a question: When did the Mūlasarvāstivādins begin to prosper in Magadha? It would not be far-fetched to estimate that it took at least several generations or even centuries for them to expand and become the predominant sect in Magadha. Therefore, the Mūlasarvāstivādins could have already taken root in Magadha before the last quarter of the 4th century or the first half of the 5th century, when the EĀ, SĀ and SĀ2 were introduced into China and translated. If so, then it is possible that EĀ, just like SĀ and SĀ2, belongs to the Mūlasarvāstivādins, who preferred to choose places in Magadha as the settings of *sūtras* because they settled in this region. This appears consistent with the fact that EĀ has an account that is only found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* as mentioned above. It is also very likely that the Mūlasarvāstivādins as latecomers were under the long-standing influence of the Mahāsāṃghikas in Magadha, and thus could have borrowed some materials from the Mahāsāṃghika tradition and incorporated them into their own texts. This may explain why EĀ contains several passages that have led scholars to ascribe EĀ to the Mahāsāṃghikas if EĀ is in fact affiliated to the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

Conclusion

A comparison of EĀ *sūtras* with their parallels shows that the redactors of this collection had a statistically significant preference for Magadha when selecting place names as the settings of *sūtras*. According to historical sources, the Mahāsāṃghikas prevailed in Magadha from the times when this sect came into being as a result of the original schism until at least the 5th century AD, when Faxian acquired this school's *Vinaya* in Magadha. EĀ (T 125) was introduced into China and translated into Chinese near the end of the 4th century AD, so this *Āgama* is likely to have been transmitted in Magadha by the Mahāsāṃghikas during the centuries

Mūlasarvāstivāda.” (T LIV 206c: 十誦律亦不是根本有部) This remark makes a clear distinction between the Mūlasarvāstivāda and the Sarvāstivāda, whose *Vinaya* is translated into Chinese as the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (T LV 20a: 薩婆多部十誦律). In the 7th century the “orthodox” Sarvāstivāda suffered a fatal decline and the Mūlasarvāstivāda was flourishing (cf. Willemen *et al*, 1998: xiii) when Yijing visited India, so it is the Mūla-sarvāstivāda, rather than the Sarvāstivāda, that was included in the list of the four major schools in his *Nanhai jigui neifazhuan*.

³⁵SĀ was translated in the period 435–443 AD according to Bucknell (2011: 37). SĀ2 was translated between 385 and 431 AD according to Bingenheimer (2011: 6).

when they were thriving there. This possibility is reinforced by the fact that several passages and even one *sūtra* in EĀ are attributed to the Mahāsāṃghikas by some scholars.

There is however another possibility. The statistics indicates that the Mūlasarvāstivādin SĀ and SĀ2 also have a strong inclination to choose Magadha as the setting for their texts. Thus EĀ might also belong to the Mūlasarvāstivāda as SĀ and SĀ2 do. This seems consistent with the fact that EĀ has an account that is only found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* but not anywhere else in Buddhist literature available to us. Therefore, it is also possible that EĀ is affiliated to the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

From the viewpoint of geographical distribution along with some textual indications, the Mahāsāṃghika and Mūlasarvāstivāda appear to be the two best candidates for the sectarian affiliation of EĀ. Admittedly, the result of this research is far from conclusive, but it echoes a valuable opinion expressed by Salomon (2008: 14):

We do not know with any confidence that the distribution of recensions of Buddhist texts in early times strictly followed sectarian, as opposed to, for example, geographical patterns. ... The assumption that one school had one and only one version of a given text, and conversely that no two schools shared the same or very similar versions of it, is a dubious one. Although such situations do seem to have developed in later times, after formal closed canons were developed by (at least some of) the schools, there is no good reason to read this situation back into earlier periods, in which this process seems not yet to have taken place or at least not to have been fully elaborated.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr Roderick S. Bucknell, Mr L.S. Cousins and Dr Marcus Bingenheimer for providing valuable suggestions. Particularly, Dr Roderick S. Bucknell acquired a French book that I needed and translated some relevant passages for me. My thanks are also due to the following: Mr Yun-kai Chang 張雲凱, who served as my research assistant from October 2009 to July 2010, helped with a preliminary tabular comparison in this study. Mr Shi-Ren Lan 藍世任 helped me obtain several sources referred to in this article. I would

like to thank the referees for their valuable suggestions and the National Science Council of Taiwan for their financial support (NSC 98-2410-H-155-060-).

Abbreviations

References to Pali texts are to the Pali Text Society editions, unless otherwise noted.

AN	<i>Aṅguttara Nikāya</i>
CBETA	CBETA Chinese Electronic Tripiṭaka Collection Version April 2010, Taipei: Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association.
Cv	<i>Cullavagga</i>
DĀ	<i>Dirgha Āgama</i> (<i>Chang ahanjing</i> 長阿含經)
Dhp-a	<i>Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā</i>
Dīp	<i>The Dīpavaṃsa: An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record</i> , ed. and tr. by Hermann Oldenberg, London: Williams and Norgate, 1879.
Divy	<i>Divyāvadāna</i> , ed. E.B. Cowell and R.A. Neil, Cambridge: The University Press, 1886.
DN	<i>Dīgha Nikāya</i>
DPPN	<i>Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names</i> , ed. G. P. Malalasekera, London: John Murray, 1937.
EĀ	<i>Ekottarika Āgama</i> (<i>Zengyi ahanjing</i> 增壹阿含經)
EĀ2	<i>Foshuo qichu sanguan jing</i> 佛說七處三觀經, identified as a different and incomplete version of the <i>Ekottarika Āgama</i>
HDC	<i>Hanyu Da Cidian</i> 漢語大詞典 (A Great Dictionary of the Chinese Language), ed. Zhufeng Luo 羅竹風, Hong Kong: 三聯書店, 1988–1994.
It	<i>Itivuttaka</i>
Ja	<i>Jātaka</i>
MĀ	<i>Madhyama Āgama</i> (<i>Zhong ahanjing</i> 中阿含經)
Mhvu	<i>Mahāvastu-Avadāna</i> , 3 vols., ed. Émile Senart, Paris, 1882–1897.
MN	<i>Majjhima Nikāya</i>
Mv	<i>Mahāvagga</i>
SĀ	<i>Samyukta Āgama</i> (<i>Za ahanjing</i> 雜阿含經)
SĀ2	<i>Other Translation of the Samyukta Āgama</i> (<i>Bieyi Za ahanjing</i> 別譯雜阿含經)
SHT	<i>Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden</i> (<i>Verzeichnis orientalischer Handschriften in Deutschland</i>), ed. W. Clawiter, L. Holzmann, L. Sander, E. Waldschmidt, H. Bechert and K. Wille, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 1965 (vol I), 1968 (vol II), 1971 (vol III), 1980 (vol IV), 1985 (vol V), 1989 (vol VI).
Skt frgm	Sanskrit fragments
SN	<i>Samyutta Nikāya</i>

- SnA *Sutta-nipāta* Commentary
 Snp *Sutta-nipāta*
 T *Taishō Shinshu Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 (Cited from CBETA)
 Vin *The Vinaya Piṭakam*, 5 volumes, ed. Hermann Oldenberg, Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1879–1883.

References

English titles in parentheses are my translations.

- Akanuma, Chizen 赤沼智善 1929. *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas* 漢巴四部四阿含互照錄, reprinted 1986, Taipei: 華宇出版社.
- 1931. *A Dictionary of Buddhist Proper Names* 印度佛教固有名詞辭典, first Indian edition 1994, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- 1981. *Bukkyō kyōten shiron* 佛教經典史論 (*On the History of Buddhist Texts*), Kyoto: 法藏館.
- Anālayo 2009. “Zeng-yi A-han”, *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, ed. W.G. Weeraratne, Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, vol. 8 no. 3, pp. 822–827.
- Allon, Mark 2001. *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Bureau, André 1955a. *Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule*, Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient.
- 1955b. *Les premiers conciles bouddhiques*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus 2011. *Studies in Āgama Literature—With Special Reference to the Shorter Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*, Taipei: Shin Wen Feng Print Co.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes 1985. “Dharma and Abhidharma”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48, 305–320.
- Bucknell, Roderick S. 2011. “The Historical Relationship between the Two Chinese Saṃyuktāgama Translations”, *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 24, 35–70.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha 1978. *Buddhist Sects in India*, 2nd edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- (ed.) 1984. *Gilgit manuscripts, Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayavastu*, Vol. 3 Part 1 (*Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica*, No.16), Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Enomoto, Fumio 榎本文雄 1984a. “Setsu issai u bu kei Āgama no tenkai: *Chū agon to Zō agon o megutte*” 説一切有部系アーガマの展開——『中阿含』と『雜阿含』をめぐって—— (The Development of the Āgamas of the Sarvāstivāda

- Lineage: Concerning the *Madhyama Āgama* and the *Samyukta Āgama*), 印度學佛教學研究 *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 32/2, 1073–1070.
- 1984b. “*Agon kyōten no seiritsu*” 阿含經典の成立 (*Formation of the Āgama Texts*), 東洋學術研究 *Journal of the Oriental Studies* 23/1, 93–108.
- 1985. “*Zō agon kyō kankei no bonbun shahon danpen: Turfan shutsudo bonbun shahon mokuroku dai 5 kan o megutte*” 『雜阿含經』關係の梵文写本断片——『Turfan出土梵文写本目錄』第5卷をめぐる—— (Sanskrit Manuscript Fragments relating to the *Samyukta Āgama*: Concerning *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden Teil 5*), 佛教研究 *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 15, 81–93.
- 1994. *A Comprehensive Study of the Chinese Samyuktāgama: Indic Texts corresponding to the Chinese Samyuktāgama as Found in the Sarvāstivāda-Mūlasarvāstivāda Literature, Part 1: *Samgītanipāta*, Kyoto: Kacho Junior College.
- 2000. “‘Mūlasarvāstivādin’ and ‘Sarvāstivādin’”, *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, ed. Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Volker M. Tschannerl, Swisstal-Odendorf, 239–250.
- Feer, M. Leon 1894. (ed.) *The Samyutta-nikāya*, Part IV, reprinted 1973, London: Pali Text Society.
- Frauwallner, E. 1956. *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, Roma: Is. M. E. O.
- Gombrich, R. F. 1990. “How the Mahāyāna Began”, *The Buddhist Forum* Vol. I, *Seminar Papers 1987–1988*, ed. T. Skorupski, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 21–30.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 1998. “Sanskrit Fragments from the Āgamas (I): The Aṅgulimālāsūtra”, *Indologica Taurinensia* 23/24, 351–362.
- Hirakawa, Akira 平川彰 1997. *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* 佛教漢梵大辭典, Tokyo: The Reiyukai.
- Hiraoka, Satoshi 平岡聡 2000. “The Sectarian Affiliation of Two Chinese Samyuktāgamas”, 印度學佛教學研究 *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 49/1, 506–500.
- 2003. “*Zō agon kyō to setsu issai u bu no ritsuzō*”, 印度學佛教學研究 *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 51/2, 818–813.
- 2007. “『増一阿含經』の成立解明に向けて(1) The Sectarian Affiliation of the *Zengyi ahan-jing* (1)”, 印度學佛教學研究 *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 56/1, 305–298.
- 2008. “『増一阿含經』の成立解明に向けて(2) The Sectarian Affiliation of the *Zengyi ahan-jing* (2)”, 印度學佛教學研究 *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 57/1, 319–312.

- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf 1916. *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan: Facsimiles with Transcripts, Translations and Notes*, Vol. I, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Horner, I.B. (tr.) 1951. *The Book of the Discipline* vol. IV (*Mahāvagga*), reprinted 2000, Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Kuan, Tse-fu 2008. *Mindfulness in Early Buddhism: New Approaches through Psychology and Textual Analysis of Pali, Chinese and Sanskrit Sources*, London and New York: Routledge.
- (forthcoming, 2012 or 2013) “The Pavāraṇā Sutta and ‘liberation in both ways’ as against ‘liberation by wisdom’”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*.
- Kumoi, Shōzen 1963. “Āgama (2)”, *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* Vol. I, Fasc. 2, ed. G.P. Malalasekera, Government of Ceylon, 244–248.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1988. *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śāka Era*, translated from the French by Sara Webb-Boin, Louvain: Peeters Press.
- Legittimo, Elsa 2008. “Reopening the Maitreya-files: Two almost identical early Maitreya *sūtra* translations in the Chinese Canon: Wrong attributions and text-historical entanglements”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 31/1–2 (2010), 251–293.
- Lin, Jia'an 林家安 2009. *Xiancun hanyi Zengyi ahanjing zhi yizhe kao* 現存漢譯《增一阿含經》之譯者考 (*An Investigation into the Translator of the Extant Chinese translation of the Ekottarika Āgama*), unpublished MA thesis, Chungli, Taiwan: Yuan Kuang Buddhist Institute, <http://old.ykbi.edu.tw/htm/thesis/94-19/94-19-03.pdf>
- Lü, Cheng 1963. “Āgama (1)”, *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* Vol. I, Fasc. 2, ed. G.P. Malalasekera, Government of Ceylon, 241–244.
- Matsumoto, Bunzaburō 松本文三郎 1914. *Butten no kenkyū* 佛典の研究 (*A Study of Buddhist Texts*), Tokyo: 丙午出版社.
- Mayeda, Egaku 前田惠學 1964. *A History of the Formation of Original Buddhist Texts* 原始佛教聖典の成立史研究, Tokyo: Sankibo-Busshorin Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元 1996. *Bukkyō bunken kenkyū* 仏教文献研究 (*A Study of Buddhist Literature*), Tokyo: 春秋社.
- Nattier, Janice J. and Prebish, Charles S. 1977. “Mahāsāṃghika Origins: The Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism”, *History of Religions* 16/3, 237–272.
- Nattier, Jan 2010. “Re-Evaluating Zhu Fonian’s *Shizhu duanjie jing* (T309): Translation or Forgery?” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2009* [ARIRIAB], Vol. 13, 231–258.

- Oberlies, Thomas 2003. “Ein bibliographischer Überblick über die kanonischen Texte der Śrāvakayāna-Schulen des Buddhismus”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasians* 47, 37–84.
- Pāsādika, Bhikkhu 2010. “Gleanings from the Chinese *Ekottarāgama* Regarding School Affiliation and Other Topics”, *Translating Buddhist Chinese: Problems and Prospects*, ed. Konrad Meisig, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 87–96.
- Przyluski, Jean 1926. *Le concile de Rājagṛha; introduction à l'histoire des canons et des sectes bouddhiques*, Paris: P. Geuthner.
- Roth, Gustav (ed.) 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Salomon, Richard 1999. *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- 2008. *Two Gāndhārī Manuscripts of the Songs of Lake Anavatapta (Anavatapta-gāthā)*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Schopen, Gregory 1997. “If You Can’t Remember, How to Make It Up: Some Monastic Rules for Redacting Canonical Texts”, *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Swisttal-Odendorf, 571–582.
- Thich Minh Chau, Bhikṣu 1991. *The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Ui, Hakuju 宇井伯壽 1965. *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū*, Vol. II 印度哲學研究 第二 (A Study of Indian Philosophy Vol. II), Tokyo: 岩波書店.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1968a. “Drei Fragmente buddhistischer Sūtras aus den Turfanhandschriften”, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 1968.1, 20–26. Reprinted 1989 in Bechert, Heinz & Kieffer-Pülz, Petra (eds.), *Ernst Waldschmidt, Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 249–255.
- 1968b. ‘Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferung vom Sthavira Śroṇa Koṭivimśa’, in *Mélanges d’indianisme. À la mémoire de Louis Renou* (= Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Fasc. 28). Paris: E. de Boccard, 773–787. Reprinted 1989 in Bechert, Heinz & Kieffer-Pülz, Petra (eds.), *Ernst Waldschmidt, Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 217–231.
- 1970. ‘Fragment of a Buddhist Sanskrit text on cosmogony’, in Tilakasiri, J. (ed.), *Añjali. Papers on Indology and Buddhism. O. H. Vijesekera felicitation volume*: 40–45, Peradeniya. Reprinted 1989 in Bechert, Heinz & Kieffer-Pülz, Petra (eds.), *Ernst Waldschmidt, Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 290–295.

- 1980. “Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and Their Relation to the Chinese Āgas”, *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, ed. Heinz Bechert, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 136–174.
- Warder, A.K. 2000. *Indian Buddhism*, 3rd revised edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. (First edition 1970)
- Willemen, Charles and Dessein, Bart and Cox, Collett (1998) *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*, Leiden: Brill.
- Yinshun 印順 1994. *Yuanshi fojiao shengdian zhi jicheng* 原始佛教聖典之集成 (*Compilation of the Original Buddhist Scriptures*), 3rd revised edition, Taipei: 正聞出版社 (First published 1971).
- Zürcher, E. 1962. *Buddhism: Its Origin and Spread in Words, Maps and Pictures*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.