

**The 'School Affiliation'
of the *Madhyama-āgama***

Bhikkhu Anālayo
University of Hamburg

Abstract

This paper argues that the original employed for translating the *Madhyama-āgama* into Chinese, now extant as entry no. 26 in the Taishō edition, was probably transmitted by Sarvāstivāda reciters. The argument proposes a basic appreciation of the idea of ‘school affiliation’ in the case of *Āgama* collections in general (I), followed by taking up general features of the *Madhyama-āgama* and three distinct markers of Sarvāstivāda influence (II).

Contents

I. Transmission Lineages and 'School Affiliation'

II. Traces of Sarvāstivāda Influence in the *Madhyama-āgama*

Conclusion

Abbreviations

References

I. Transmission Lineages and ‘School Affiliation’

An important backdrop for discussions of the ‘school affiliation’ of a particular text or a scriptural collection as a whole is the fact that some degree of variation among textual collections transmitted by reciters who belong to a particular transmission lineage is to be expected, in view of the fluctuating nature of oral transmission over centuries. Such recognition helps one to appreciate that individual instances of lack of conformity need not invariably reflect the influence of the school affiliation of the transmitters of a particular text.

In order to demonstrate this point, it seems best to take up an example whose school affiliation is beyond doubt. As the main topic of this paper is the *Madhyama-āgama*, the most suitable example would therefore be its Theravāda counterpart,¹ the *Majjhima-nikāya*. For the purpose of illustration, purely as an imaginary scenario to test out the methodology appropriate for assessing questions of school affiliation, one might imagine what would emerge if the *Majjhima-nikāya* were preserved only in translation and apart from the other Pali *Nikāyas*. Such a scenario would correspond as closely as possible to the situation of the *Madhyama-āgama* extant in Chinese. In such a scenario and on following the usual approach, in order to determine whether the school affiliation of this *Majjhima-nikāya* is indeed Theravāda, one would examine the *Majjhima-nikāya* in the light of corresponding passages in the Theravāda *Vinaya*, Theravāda *Abhidhamma* and Theravāda commentarial tradition.

Such examination brings to light two instances, already discussed in Anālayo (2012: 520–521), where discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* vary from the Theravāda *Vinaya*. One difference concerns the se-

¹ On the term Theravāda see Anālayo 2013.

quence of enumerating the seven ways of settling litigations;² the other difference manifests in the form of a narrative piece that clearly belongs to an episode described in the *Majjhima-nikāya*, but is nevertheless not found in the actual discourse, occurring instead in the Theravāda *Vinaya*.³

In addition to these two, a more substantial difference emerges when comparing the expositions of *satipaṭṭhāna* meditation in the *Majjhima-nikāya* to the coverage given to the same topic in the analysis according to the method of the discourses (*suttantabhājanīya*) in the *Vibhaṅga*, an early work of the Theravāda *Abhidhamma*. Instead of six distinct contemplations of the body and five contemplations of *dhammas*, the *Vibhaṅga* has only a single contemplation of the body (concerned with its anatomical parts) and only two contemplations of *dhammas* (concerned with the hindrances and the awakening factors).⁴

Even the one exercise in common between the *Majjhima-nikāya* and the *Vibhaṅga*, contemplation of the anatomical parts, is not unproblematic. The actual listing of such parts in the discourse differs from the Theravāda commentarial tradition. Whereas discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* list thirty-one anatomical parts,⁵ the *Visuddhimagga* lists thirty-two, adding the brain to the parts mentioned in the discourse.⁶ The brain is also part of a listing of anatomical parts in a

² MN 104 at MN II 247,19 has decision by majority as the second item in its actual exposition, whereas Vin IV 207,5 has it in fifth position (the introductory listing in MN 104 at MN II 247,8 instead corresponds to Vin IV 207,5).

³ MN 82 at MN II 61,26 to 65,6 and Vin III 148,30 to 148,34.

⁴ MN 10 at MN I 56,11 to 59,10 and 60,7 to 62,33 compared to Vibh 193,17 to 194,24 and 199,12 to 201,41; these differences have already been noted by Bronkhorst 1985.

⁵ See, e.g., MN 10 at MN I 57,15 to 57,20 and MN 119 at MN III 90,14 to 90,19.

⁶ Vism 240,24 explains that its additional reference to the brain should be understood as implicitly covered by the bone marrow, mentioned among the thirty-one parts.

version of the *Girimānanda-sutta* preserved in Tibetan translation,⁷ which as shown by Skilling (1993) is part of a set of Theravāda texts brought by a Sri Lankan monk to Tibet.

Other variations emerge when comparing discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* with the Theravāda commentarial tradition. One of these involves an explicit denial of the transfer of merit in a *Majjhima-nikāya* discourse, which stands in stark contrast to a central doctrine in traditional Theravāda thought and practice.⁸ Needless to say, the notion of merit transfer is of vital importance in ritual daily practice in Theravāda countries in South and Southeast Asia.

Another instance involves a conception of the seventh stage of purification that differs from the *Visuddhimagga*.⁹ The seven stages of purification serve as the basic scaffolding for the *Visuddhimagga* and have in turn acquired central importance in Theravāda insight meditation, so that this difference is surely significant.

References to three influxes (*āsava*) in the *Majjhima-nikāya* contrast with the four influxes recognized in the commentarial tradition.¹⁰ Given that the final goal of Buddhist soteriology is to remove the influxes, differing conceptions regarding what actually needs to be removed are not a minor matter.

Yet another difference concerns the notion of being on the path to the fruition of one of the four levels of awakening, which in a *Majjhima-nikāya* discourse clearly involves a substantial time period,

⁷ D 38 *shes ka* 277a3: *glad pa* or Q 754 *sher tsi* 293b8: *klad pa*; translated in Anālayo 2016b: 102.

⁸ MN 35 at MN I 236,35 to 237,3. This has already been pointed out by Witanachchi 1987: 155 and Egge 2002: 58; see also Anālayo 2010.

⁹ MN 24 at MN I 148,12 compared to Vism 672,4; see in more detail Anālayo 2005, 2009 and 2016c.

¹⁰ See, e.g., MN 9 at MN I 55,10 in contrast to As 369,22, which adds the influx of views (both listings are found in Vibh 364,12 and Vibh 373,33).

but in the commentaries only a single moment.¹¹ This is another issue of considerable doctrinal and practical importance, perhaps even more significant than the differing listings of the influxes.

Two discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* refer to the presence of the *gandhabba* as a necessary condition for conception, a reference that implies some sort of an interim existence. The denial of the notion of an interim existence is a tenet characteristic of the Theravāda tradition.¹² This results in substantially different conceptualizations of the process of rebirth, another doctrine of considerable importance. Continuing with the same topic of rebirth, a *Majjhima-nikāya* discourse and the Theravāda commentarial tradition also disagree as to the realm in which the Buddha's mother was reborn.¹³

In sum, this short survey would hopefully have shown that, on employing the usual methodology for assessing school affiliation, several disagreements and significant variations between discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* collection and other Theravāda texts can be identified. This goes to show that some degree of variation is not in itself a decisive criterion for assessing issues of school affiliation.¹⁴

As pointed out by Boucher (2008: 190) in relation to variations between listings of the *bodhipakṣyadharmas* in discourses in the *Āgamas* and Pali *Nikāyas*:

¹¹ MN 142 at MN III 254,32 to 255,7 and Ps V 72,15; see also Gethin 1992: 131–132 and Anālayo 2012c: 77.

¹² MN 38 at MN I 265,37 and MN 93 at MN II 157,1; for a survey of the Buddhist schools that accepted or rejected the intermediate existence see Bareau 1955: 291.

¹³ MN 123 at MN III 122,3 reports that Māyā was reborn in Tusita; according to As 1,4 she was reborn in the Heaven of the Thirty-three; see also Anālayo 2012d: 25–27.

¹⁴ The lack of thorough homogenization of the texts also implies, as I already pointed out in Anālayo 2011: 458, “that it is rather improbable that instances where they agree should be entirely due to a later leveling of texts.”

one might be left to wonder whether the competing lists ... really represent a doctrinally distinctive agenda by which Buddhist “schools” attempted to differentiate themselves. The problem with always seeing *nikāya* as at the heart of these differences is that it occludes other possible explanations ... we might do well to consider explanations for their distinctiveness that goes (sic) beyond our modern proclivity for school affiliation.¹⁵

This pertinent observation holds all the more for textual transmission within the Mūlasarvāstivāda/Sarvāstivāda traditions, spread over a remarkably broad geographical area. In fact in the case of texts on monastic discipline it has by now become clear that we need to think in terms of an “existence of multiple Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayas*”.¹⁶

The comparison with *Vinaya* texts is also significant from another perspective. Kuan (2013: 609) notes that transmitters and translators

of *Āgama* texts and collections never found it necessary to add school names to their texts, and in this regard they notably differed from those who dealt with *Vinaya* texts ... in order to distinguish between *nikāya* lineages and maintain one’s own identity, some Buddhists found it necessary to label the various schools’ *Vinayas* with *nikāya* names.

This difference between *Vinaya* and *Āgama* texts makes it worth reflecting how far the identification of school affiliation actually captures an essential and intrinsically important aspect of an *Āgama* collection. Hartmann (2013: 48) concludes a study of the *Maitreya-samitināṭaka* and the *Maitrisimit* by noting that, if his observations

¹⁵ Fussman 2012: 198 notes that “chaque monastère devait avoir des collections de manuscrits très légèrement différentes de celles des monastères voisins, qu’ils appartiennent au même *nikāya* ou non.”

¹⁶ Clarke 2015: 73.

are correct, then the question of school affiliation pursues something of little, if any, relevance to authors and users of the texts in question.¹⁷ This does not mean that one should turn a blind eye on school affiliation. But it might be worth reflecting how far such issues can be pursued and to what degree they can indeed help us to understand and appreciate the nature of this type of texts or whether they might at times rather obfuscate the complex set of conditions that have influenced their coming into existence. Salomon (2008: 14) queries

how meaningful such supposed 'school affiliations' really are, especially in the contexts of earlier periods for which it is by no means certain that we are dealing with canonically fixed texts associated with specific schools. In other words, one should not automatically assume that a particular version of a text attested in an early manuscript belongs to one and only one school, for 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.

II. Traces of Sarvāstivāda Influence in the *Madhyama-āgama*

Based on an appreciation of the fact that some degree of variation is the natural result of the oral (and only subsequently written) transmission of *Āgama* texts, if one wishes to pursue the issue of school

¹⁷ The original reads: "wenn die voranstehend vorgetragenen Überlegungen zutreffen, dann geht die Frage nach der Schulzugehörigkeit bei vielen Werken, und dazu zählt auch die *Maitrisimit*, ebenso wie die Frage nach der Hīnayāna/Mahāyāna-Zugehörigkeit einfach ins Leere, dann zielt sie nämlich auf Kategorisierungen, die für Verfasser und Benutzer offenbar keine Wirklichkeit oder zumindest keine praktische Bedeutung besessen haben."

affiliation, the question arises as to what criteria should be employed. In the case of the *Āgamas*, emphasis on these collections as a sort of product of a particular Buddhist school needs to be combined with an awareness that the respective texts have come into being well before the arising of Buddhist schools. Therefore to speak of the ‘school affiliation’ of an *Āgama* is different from applying the same category to exegetical or doctrinal texts; in fact, as noted above, it is even different from the case of *Vinaya* literature.

In the context of *Āgama* studies, distinctions of school affiliation are useful predominantly from a historical perspective and in terms of attempting to discern distinct transmission lineages as a basis for evaluating the significance of correspondences and variations in comparative studies.¹⁸ Similarities between closely related transmission lineages are of lesser weight than similarities between transmission lineages that appear to have been operating independently for a considerable time period, such as, for example, Mahāsāṅghika and Theravāda. It is predominantly in this sense that the issue of determining the school affiliation of a particular *Āgama* can help in appreciating early Buddhist thought and history.

In the case of the *Madhyama-āgama*, for some time in academic writings there has been a consensus that this collection would have been transmitted by Sarvāstivāda reciters.¹⁹ Furthermore Enomoto (1984: 198) argues that the *Madhyama-āgama* preserved in Chinese represents an earlier and less developed version of *Madhyama-āgama* collections preserved by Sarvāstivāda reciters.

Chung and Fukita (2011: 13–34) present a detailed discussion of the school affiliation of the *Madhyama-āgama* and express their res-

¹⁸ On the significance of correspondences between parallel versions in general see Anālayo 2012a.

¹⁹ See, e.g., Lü Cheng 1963: 242, Minh Chau 1964 [1991]: 27, Waldschmidt 1980: 136, Mayeda 1985: 98, Enomoto 1986: 21, Hirakawa 1987: 513, Oberlies 2003: 64.

ervation concerning the Sarvāstivāda identification, highlighting, among other points, divergences between the *Madhyama-āgama* and the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* preserved in Chinese translation (T 1435). They conclude that “we have considerable difficulty in supporting the view that the *Zhong-ahanjing* derives from the Sarvāstivāda school, at least insofar as we define the term ‘school’ as a community of Buddhist monks who share a common canonical tradition” (p. 33). In reply, in Anālayo (2012b: 516–521) I argue that in view of the nature of oral transmission some divergences are to be expected.

Chung (2014 and 2017) then draws attention to differences between the *Puṇya-sūtra* of the *Ekottarika-āgama* preserved in Gilgit fragments and *Madhyama-āgama* discourse no. 138, 福經, as well as between the **Śrutānṛśamsa-sūtra* of the *Dīrgha-āgama* preserved in Gilgit fragments and *Madhyama-āgama* discourse no. 147, 聞德經, reiterating the need to reassess the supposed Sarvāstivāda affiliation of the *Madhyama-āgama* preserved in Chinese translation. Chung (2014: 101) notes that “*Sūtras* preserved in the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama* differ considerably in most cases from the corresponding Sanskrit versions known so far.” This is of course a significant point, but such differences need to be evaluated against the background that it is natural for orally transmitted text to exhibit differences. In fact Chung (2014: 100) finds that the *Puṇya-sūtra* and *Madhyama-āgama* discourse no. 138, 福經, “share a similar framework and content, albeit differences in detail are obvious.” That is, the differences in detail occur in the context of similarities in general aspects.

When evaluating such differences, it needs to be kept in mind, as noted by Strauch (2017: 367), that

considerable differences between texts do by no means exclude the possibility that they were used by monks belonging to the same school.

The examples provided earlier from the *Majjhima-nikāya* would hopefully have illustrated the fact that the *Madhyama-āgama* extant in Chinese needs to be appreciated as the final product of centuries of oral transmission, with ample opportunities for the introduction of variations and change, far beyond what would have happened during the transposition from one Indic language to another. Although *Āgama* research inevitably requires working with written texts in manuscript and printed form, the texts themselves have not always been fixed in writing, hence variations are not confined to redactional changes that happened in the written medium.²⁰

Comparable to the need for thinking in terms of multiple Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayas*, it seems best to approach the early discourse collections in terms of multiple *Āgama* traditions. In the context of such multiple *Āgama* traditions, within related transmission lineages maintained by reciters that belong to a particular school we would indeed expect differences in detail alongside general agreement. As pointed out in a different context by Salomon (2008: 14),

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.

Given that the texts that make up the *Madhyama-āgama* are not in themselves products of a particular school, but have come into being

²⁰ On the oral and written dimensions in the stages that can be discerned in the formation and transmission of *Āgama* material see Salomon 2017.

before the arising of a distinct sense of school identity, variations of the type identified by Chung cannot be understood by depending entirely on the alternatives of a single or two separate Sarvāstivāda traditions. This fails to appreciate that such variations could have come into existence earlier and quite independent of any relationship to school identity. The entire trajectory of a particular lineage of *Āgama* transmission goes far beyond the confines of the existence of a specific school.

Since the texts found in an *Āgama* have come into existence before the formation of schools, this in turn has implications for the type of evidence that they can exhibit in matters of school affiliation. Evidence that a particular discourse collection was transmitted by a lineage of reciters who at some point of time came to identify themselves as members of one or the other Buddhist school can only be expected to occur somewhat sporadically. In relation to an already existing textual corpus like an *Āgama* collection, such sporadic influence can be identified in the form of additions or changes that are in line with school tenets or preferences.

In the case of the *Madhyama-āgama* I am aware of three discourses with distinct markers pointing to such Sarvāstivāda tenets or preferences; further research may well bring to light more.²¹ When compared to the evidence that can be adduced in support of the school affiliation of other *Āgamas*, these three distinct markers already make a fairly good case for the school affiliation of the *Madhyama-āgama*.

The first of these three markers is the 'Discourse on Explaining the Spheres', 說處經, *Madhyama-āgama* discourse no. 86. The 'Discourse on Explaining the Spheres', which is without a known parallel, reports the Buddha delineating a series of topics that Ānanda should teach junior monks.²² The majority of these topics recur as

²¹ Two of the three markers that I discuss here have already been mentioned by Minh Chau 1964 [1991] (see notes 23 and 26 below) and the third by myself in 2008 (see note 30 below).

²² MĀ 86 at T I 562a19 to 565c26; the identification of this discourse by

chapter headings in the *Dharmaskandha*, an important early work in the Sarvāstivāda canonical *Abhidharma* collection.²³ Since we know that early *Abhidharma* works developed on the basis of and in close dialogue with the early discourses, this shows fairly conclusively that a *Madhyama-āgama* discourse served as the scaffolding for an exposition of Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma* thought. For a discourse without known parallels to exhibit such a close relationship to a central and early *Abhidharma* treatise offers quite a strong basis for the hypothesis that the *Madhyama-āgama* collection was transmitted within a Sarvāstivāda milieu.

The second such marker occurs in the ‘Discourse on Fields of Merit’, 福田經, *Madhyama-āgama* discourse no. 127, which in agreement with parallels in the *Samyukta-āgama* and the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* distinguishes between those who are in training and those who are beyond training, that is, who have become *arhats*.²⁴ Unlike its two parallels, the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse provides lists for each of these two types of noble beings. Its listing for those who are beyond training includes an *arhat* liable to fall away from his or her attainment.²⁵ The same notion can be found as part of a listing of *arhats* in a discourse quotation in the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*.²⁶ This is another compelling marker in the form of a passage that,

Akanuma 1929 [1990]: 13 as a parallel to MN 148 is not correct; see Anālayo 2011: 838 note 96. Instead MĀ 86 should be reckoned as not having a known parallel.

²³ A survey of these correspondences can be found in Watanabe 1983 [1996]: 54; see also Minh Chau 1964 [1991]: 35–36 and Anālayo 2014: 41–44.

²⁴ MĀ 127 at T I 616a5 to 616c25 and its parallels SĀ 992 at T II 258c11 to 258c20 and AN 2.4.4 at AN I 62,33 to 63,14.

²⁵ MĀ 127 at T I 616a18: 退法.

²⁶ Wogihara 1936: 566,34; this has already been noticed by Minh Chau 1964 [1991]: 26–27. According to the survey of Japanese scholarship on the school affiliation of the *Madhyama-āgama* by Fukita 2017, the same had already been mentioned by Akanuma in lecture notes published in 1939.

judging from its parallels, appears to have been expanded during transmission.²⁷ This expansion has served to accommodate a Sarvāstivāda tenet which stands in contrast to the early Buddhist position according to which an *arhat*'s attainment of liberation is irreversible.²⁸

The third marker can be found in the 'Discourse on a *Deva* at the Hot Spring Grove', 溫泉林天經, *Madhyama-āgama* discourse no. 165, which has a parallel in the *Majjhima-nikāya*.²⁹ Unlike its Pali parallel, the *Madhyama-āgama* version qualifies sense organs of the past as 'really' existing.³⁰ This apparently later change of the formulation otherwise shared with the *Majjhima-nikāya* version reflects the central tenet that gave the Greater Sarvāstivāda their name; in fact the expression found in this discourse recurs in the **Mahāvibhāṣā*.³¹

For an *Āgama* collection these three markers furnish fairly strong evidence. During the process of transmission, one *Madhyama-āgama* discourse without parallels apparently exerted a determining influence on a central work in the nascent Abhidharma enterprise of the Sarvās-

²⁷ It is particularly noteworthy that such an expansion is not only absent from AN 2.4.4, but also from SĀ 992. This shows that the expansion must have happened at a comparably late point in time, as it did not affect the version of what otherwise is the same discourse in the Mūla-sarvāstivāda *Samyukta-āgama* extant in Chinese translation as T 99.

²⁸ For a survey of the schools that upheld or opposed this tenet see Bareau 1995: 261; see also Miyashita 1981 [1982]. Another instance that might reflect the same tenet can be found in MĀ 178 at T I 719b2, which describes recluses and brahmins who regress not only in relation to their liberation of mind, but also in relation to their liberation by wisdom, 慧解脫衰退. The parallel MN 25 at MN I 156,30 mentions only liberation of the mind; see also Anālayo 2011: 168–169.

²⁹ MĀ 165 at T I 696b26 to 698c1 and MN 133 at MN III 192,1 to 199,17.

³⁰ MĀ 165 at T I 697c20: 實有 ... 過去; see Anālayo 2008: 7. This case seems to be stronger evidence than another such instance noted by Minh Chau 1964 [1991]: 23–24, on which see Anālayo 2011: 806 note 241.

³¹ T 1545 at T XXVII 393a24: 實有過去; see also Bareau 1955: 137 and Cox 1995: 136–137.

tivādins. Two notions held among Sarvāstivādins, namely the assertion that an *arhat* can fall away from his or her level of awakening and the notion that things of the past truly exist, found expressions in two discourses, where comparative study enables the identification of the respective passages as the results of later change. These three instances provide a firm basis for the hypothesis that the *Madhyama-āgama* was transmitted by Sarvāstivādins.

What is perhaps of even more importance, however, is the basic pattern that emerges from comparative studies. These result in a general picture where Pali discourses tend to be close to their *Dīrgha-āgama* parallels as well as to discourse quotations in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya* and the **Śāriputrābhidharma*,³² whenever these are extant. Comparable to these two is the relationship between the *Madhyama-āgama* on the one hand and the *Samyukta-āgama* together with discourse quotations in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* and the *Abhidharma-kośopāyikā-ṭīkā* on the other hand. In spite of some internal distance, this latter group shares elements that make it distant from the former group of the Pali discourses together with the *Dīrgha-āgama*. A line of transmission apart from all of these taken together is represented by the *Ekottarika-āgama*.³³ In this way, the overall picture that emerges from comparative study concords with the hypothesis that the *Madhyama-āgama* was transmitted within a Sarvāstivāda transmission lineage.

Since such general impressions are based on a broad range of detailed studies, in the present context it is not possible to reproduce all the relevant data.³⁴ However, in another article under preparation a

³² On this work see, e.g., Barea 1950.

³³ On the school affiliation of the *Ekottarika-āgama* see Anālayo 2016a: 172–178 and 211–214.

³⁴ This pattern becomes evident in my comparative study of the *Majjhima-nikāya* (Anālayo 2011) in the substantial number of cases that involve a *Madhyama-āgama* parallel.

component of this situation will be taken up in more detail, namely *uddāna* references and discourse quotations in the *Abhidharmakośo-pāyika-ṭīkā* that are related to the *Madhyama-āgama*.³⁵ These confirm that the *Madhyama-āgama* exhibits minor variations alongside major agreements with Mūlasarvāstivāda texts, as to be expected of a discourse collection transmitted by Sarvāstivāda reciters.

Conclusion

The question of the school affiliation of an *Āgama* collection needs to be posed based on appreciating the nature of such textual collections. Being the product of oral transmission over centuries, it is only natural that within the textual corpus of a particular Buddhist school some variations occur, as evidenced by a comparison of *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses with other Theravāda texts. In light of this, it is not surprising that similar variations should be found among texts associated with the Sarvāstivāda or Mūlasarvāstivāda. Such variations reflect the vicissitude of oral transmission, and it would amount to losing sight of the oral nature of the early discourse collections if minor differences were to be construed as in themselves putting into question the school identity of a particular collection.

In the case of the *Madhyama-āgama* extant in Chinese, the general pattern of its discourses, when compared to discourses of other traditions, as well as three specific markers point to the Sarvāstivāda tradition. To the extent to which the school affiliation of the *Madhyama-āgama* can be identified, the wider Sarvāstivāda is clearly the most straightforward option.

³⁵ See Honjō et al. in preparation.

Abbreviations

AN	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya</i>
As	<i>Atthasālinī</i>
D	Derge edition
MĀ	<i>Madhyama-āgama</i>
MN	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
Ps	<i>Papañcasūdanī</i>
Q	Qianlong (Peking) edition
T	Taishō edition (CBETA digital edition)
Vibh	<i>Vibhaṅga</i>
Vin	<i>Vinayaṭṭaka</i>
Vism	<i>Visuddhimagga</i>

References

- Akanuma, Chizen 1929 [1990]: *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pāli Nikāyas*, Delhi: Sri Satguru.
- Allon, Mark 2001: *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras, British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Anālayo 2005: “The Seven Stages of Purification in Comparative Perspective”, *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka*, 3: 126–138.
- 2008: “The Verses on an Auspicious Night, Explained by Mahākaccāna – A Study and Translation of the Chinese Version”, *Canadian Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 4: 5–27 (reprinted in id. 2012b: 421–448).
- 2009: “The Treaties on the Path to Liberation (解脫道論) and the Visuddhimagga”, *Fuyan Buddhist Studies*, 4: 1–15.

- 2010: “Saccaka’s Challenge – A Study of the Saṃyukta-āgama Parallel to the Cūlasaccaka-sutta in Relation to the Notion of Merit Transfer”, *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal*, 23: 39–70.
- 2011: *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- 2012a: “The Historical Value of the Pāli Discourses”, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 55: 223–253.
- 2012b: *Madhyama-āgama Studies*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- 2012c: “Purification in Early Buddhist Discourse and Buddhist Ethics”, *Buddhist Studies / 佛教研究*, 40: 67–97.
- 2012d: “Teaching the Abhidharma in the Heaven of the Thirty-three, The Buddha and His Mother”, *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies*, 2: 9–35.
- 2013: “A Note on the Term Theravāda”, *Buddhist Studies Review*, 30.2: 216–235.
- 2014: *The Dawn of Abhidharma*, Hamburg: Hamburg University Press.
- 2016a: *Ekottarika-āgama Studies*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- 2016b: *Mindfully Facing Disease and Death, Compassionate Advice from Early Buddhist Texts*, Cambridge: Windhorse.
- 2016c: “Selected Madhyama-āgama Passages and their Pāli Parallels”, *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies* (forthcoming).
- Bareau, André 1950: “Les Origines du Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra”, *Muséon*, 43: 69–95.
- 1955: *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*, Paris: Publications de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient.
- Boucher, Daniel 2008: [review of Allon 2001], *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, 18: 189–193.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes 1985: “Dharma and Abhidharma”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 48: 305–320.

- Chung, Jin-il 2014: “Puṇya-sūtra of the Ekottarikāgama in Comparison with the Fu-jing of the Chinese Madhyamāgama”, *Critical Review for Buddhist Studies*, 16: 9–33.
- 2017: “Śrūtānṛśamsa-sūtra of the Dīrgha-āgama in Comparison with the Wende jing 聞德經 of the Madhyama-āgama”, in Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Madhyama-āgama*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 113–146.
- and Fukita Takamichi 2011: *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Madhyamāgama, Including References to Sanskrit Parallels, Citations, Numerical Categories of Doctrinal Concepts and Stock Phrases*, Tokyo: Sankibo Press.
- Clarke, Shayne 2015: “Vinayas”, in Jonathan Silk, Oskar von Hinüber and Vincent Eltschinger (ed.), *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, 60–87, Leiden: Brill.
- Cox, Collett 1995: *Disputed Dharmas, Early Buddhist Theories on Existence, An Annotated Translation of the Section on Factors Dissociated from Thought from Saṅghabhadra’s Nyāyānusāra*, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- EGGE, James R. 2002: *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism*, Surrey: Curzon.
- Enomoto, Fumio 1984: “The Formation and Development of the Sarvāstivāda Scriptures”, in Tatsuro Yamamoto (ed.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa, Tokyo-Kyoto 31st August – 7th September 1983*, Tokyo: Tōhō Gakkai, 197–198.
- 1986: “On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas”, *Buddhist Studies Review*, 3.1: 19–30.
- Fukita, Takamichi 2017: “Back to the Future of Prof. Akanuma’s Age, A Research History of the School Affiliation of the Madhyama-āgama in Japan”, in Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Madhyama-āgama*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 147–176.

- Fussman, Gérard 2012: [review of Glass 2007], *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 55.2: 189–200.
- Gethin, Rupert 1992: *The Buddhist Path to Awakening, A Study of the Bodhi-Pakkhiyā Dhammā*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Glass, Andrew 2007: *Four Gāndhārī Saṃyuktāgama Sūtras, Senior Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 2013: “Die Schulzugehörigkeit von Maitreya-samitinātaka und Maitrisimit”, in Yukiko Kasai, Abdurishid Yakup and Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst (ed.), *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit, Symposium anlässlich des 100. Jahrestages der Entzifferung des Tocharischen, Berlin, 3. und 4. April 2008*, Brepols: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 37–50.
- Hirakawa, Akira 1987: “Buddhist Literature: Survey of Texts”, in M. Eliade (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 2: 509–529.
- Honjō, Yoshifumi, Bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā and Bhikkhu Anālayo (in preparation): “The Madhyama-āgama and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā”.
- Kuan, Tse-fu 2013: “Legends and Transcendence: Sectarian Affiliations of the Ekottarika Āgama in Chinese Translation”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 133.4: 607–634.
- Lü Cheng 1963: “Āgama”, in G.P. Malalasekera (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, 1.2: 241–244.
- Mayeda, Egaku 1985: “Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas”, in Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur, Erster Teil*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1: 94–103.
- Minh Chau, Thich 1964 [1991]: *The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Miyashita, Seiki 1981 [1982]: “On the Retrogression of the Arhat in the Abhidharmakośa”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, 印度學佛教學研究, 30.2: 1030–1026.
- Oberlies, Thomas 2003: “Ein bibliographischer Überblick über die kanonischen Texte der Śrāvakayāna-Schulen des Buddhismus (ausgenommen der des Mahāvihāra-Theravāda)”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 47: 37–84.
- Salomon, Richard 2008: *Two Gāndhārī Manuscripts of the Songs of Lake Anavatapta (Anavatapta-gāthā)*, *British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 1 and Senior Scroll 14*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- 2017: “On the Evolution of Written Āgama Collections in Northern Buddhist Traditions”, in Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Madhyama-āgama*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 239–268.
- Skilling, Peter 1993: “Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 19: 69–201.
- Strauch, Ingo 2017: “The Indic Versions of the *Dakṣiṇāvibhaṅga-sūtra, Some Thoughts on the Early Transmission of Āgama Texts”, in Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Madhyama-āgama*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 327–373.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1980: “Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas”, in Heinz Bechert (ed.), *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 136–174.
- Watanabe, Fumimaro 1983/1996: *Philosophy and its Development in the Nikāyas and Abhidhamma*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Wogihara, Unrai 1936: *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā by Yaśomitra, Part II*, Tokyo: The Publishing Association of Abhidharmakośavyākhyā.
- Witanachchi, C. 1987: “Transference of Merit – the So-called”, in David J. Kalupahana (ed.), *Buddhist Philosophy and Culture, Essays in Honour of N.A. Jayawickrama*, Colombo: N.A. Jayawickrema Felicitation Volume Committee, 153–168.