

Each school appears to have had its Tripiṭaka or “Three-baskets”, comprising Sūtra, Vinaya, and Abhidharma. Most of these texts were early converted from various Prakrits (Middle Indo-Aryan dialects) into “Buddhist Sanskrit”. However, the Tāmraśāṭīya school’s version of the Tripiṭaka has been preserved in a Prakrit, the so-called Pāli (literally, “text”), which is based on a dialect from the region of Ujjenī (Ujjayānī), capital of Avanti, in western India.¹⁶ Only this Pāli version has been preserved intact.¹⁷ Most of the other Tripiṭakas were subsequently lost, but major portions are preserved in Chinese translations.

Pāli Buddhism has preserved all four Nikāyas of the Sūtra-ṭiṭaka (P. Sutta-ṭiṭaka), i.e. Dīgha-nikāya (abbreviated DN), Majjhima-nikāya (MN), Saṃyutta-nikāya (SN), and Aṅguttara-nikāya (AN), plus a fifth, the Khuddaka-nikāya or “Minor Collection”. Other schools are represented by Chinese translations of just one or two of the four Nikāyas/Āgamas. For the Sarvāstivāda we have Chinese translations of the Saṃyuktāgama (SA)¹⁸ and Madhyamāgama (MA), which are counterparts of the Pāli SN and MN. For

- 16 MAYEDA, pp. 34-35, 47-51; 14-17 (in English Summary). Yin Shun, *Formation*, pp. 47-48. MIZUNO Kōgen, パーリ語文法 Pāri-go Bunpō *A Grammar of the Pali Language - with supplementary essays on the history of Pali studies* (1955; Sankibō, Tokyo, 1978), p. 26; MIZUNO Kōgen, *Buddhist Sutras: Origin, Development, Transmission* (1982; sixth printing, Kōsei Publishing Co., Tokyo, 1995), pp. 28-30.
- 17 According to *Dīpavaṃsa* (XX, 20-21) and *Mahāvāṃsa* (XXXIII, 100-101), the orally transmitted Pāli records (both “text of the three-baskets” ṭiṭakattayapāli and its “commentary” aṭṭhakathā) were first systemically written down by monks during the reign of King Vaṭṭagāmaṇī (29-17 BC) of Sri Lanka. G. P. MALALASEKERA, *The Pāli Literature of Ceylon* (1928; Gunasena, Colombo, 1958), pp. 43-47; MAYEDA, pp. 615, 790-791; K. R. NORMAN, *Pāli Literature (= A History of Indian Literature, vol. VII, Fasc. 2, ed. Jan GONDA)* (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1983), pp. 10-11.
- 18 T 2, No. 99. Yin Shun, *Formation*, pp. 97-98. Some scholars consider that the Chinese SA is most closely related to the Mūla-sarvāstivāda tradition. ENOMOTO Fumio, “Udānavarga 諸本と雜阿含經、別譯雜阿含經、中阿含經の部派歸屬” Udānavarga Shohon to Zōagonkyō, Betsuyakuzōagonkyō Chūagonkyō no Buha Kizoku “On the Recensions of the Udānavarga and the Schools to which the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama, the smaller Chinese Saṃyuktāgama, and the Chinese Madhyamāgama are to be Ascribed”, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 28/2 (1980. 3), pp. 55-57; Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN, “Beiträge zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer buddhistischer Materialien”, in Heinz BECHERT ed., *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hinayāna-Literatur* (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, 3), Teil 2 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1987), pp. 304-403. See also ENOMOTO Fumio, “On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chifese Āgamas”, *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 3, No. 1 (1986), pp. 19-30. Cf. also MAYEDA Egaku, “Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas”, *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hinayāna-Literatur*, Teil 1 (Göttingen, 1985), pp. 94-103.