

## Article

# Warriors Who Do Not Kill in War: A Buddhist Interpretation of the Warrior's Role in Relation to the Precept against Killing

Tsunehiko Sugiki

Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hiroshima University, 1-7-1 Kagamiyama, Higashihiroshima 739-8521, Japan; sugiki@hiroshima-u.ac.jp; Tel.: +81-824-24-6410

Received: 24 September 2020; Accepted: 9 October 2020; Published: 16 October 2020



**Abstract:** Buddhist scriptures in ancient South Asia include discourses that teach measures by which a warrior can face problems in confrontation with foreign armies and domestic rebel troops without resorting to killing them in battle. These moderate measures have not attracted much attention in previous studies on Buddhist statecraft and warfare. There are eleven kinds, and they can be organized according to the following three types: retreat from the role of warrior, resolution without pitched battle, and fighting in a pitched battle without killing. Similar ideas regarding measures for resolving military confrontations can be found in Indian Classics in the context of statecraft. The compilers of the Buddhist discourses collected ideas about similar measures from common sources and reshaped those borrowed ideas from the perspective of the Buddhist precept against killing. A warrior who implemented such measures did not acquire as much negative karmic potential as intentional killing produces. In premodern warrior societies, religion often provided the institutional basis for both a code of ethics and a soteriology for warriors, for whom fighting was in fulfillment of their social role. The compilation of discourses containing measures that do not involve killing represents an aspect of Buddhism's function in ancient South Asia.

**Keywords:** Buddhism; South Asia; military ethics; soteriology; war; moderate; *Arthaśāstra*

## 1. Introduction

In ancient South Asia, kings and other warriors, as well as religious specialists such as brahmins and renouncers, constituted an important social stratum.<sup>1</sup> They were given a special role in lay society. As Kane put it, the fundamental function of a king is to protect his people, and the *daṇḍa*, i.e., the use of armed forces comprised of warriors to counter foreign armies and domestic rebel troops (as well as to punish domestic criminals, which this paper does not address), was often an important means of offering that protection.<sup>2</sup> However, such protection may involve killing opponents. According to the general Buddhist view of karmic law, intentional killing creates negative karmic potential. For committing such an act, a killer suffers negative karmic retribution, typically rebirth to a miserable existence, such as hell. This dilemma raises the question: what instructions do Buddhist scriptures provide for warriors who must confront armed opponents in order to fulfill their social role?

Buddhist instructions for warriors in and around war can roughly be divided into three categories in terms of whether a warrior is allowed to kill his opponents in battle: instructions from the standpoint

<sup>1</sup> I use the term “warrior” simply to refer to people who are described in Buddhist scriptures as assuming a role that requires them to fight in battle. It is not important from the perspective of this paper whether they are completely identical to what the Brahmanical *Dharma* scriptures call *kṣatriya*.

<sup>2</sup> (Kane 1993, p. 56).

that intentional killing must be avoided; instructions from the standpoint that if certain measures are taken, a warrior who intentionally kills his opponents can still attain rebirth in heaven; and instructions that do not articulate whether a warrior is allowed to kill in battle. In this paper, I focus on the first set of instructions,<sup>3</sup> which teach moderate measures by which a warrior can face (albeit not necessarily solve) problems in confrontation without killing his opponents.

This paper presents an examination of Buddhist discourses on measures by which a warrior can face problems in confrontation with armed opponents without resorting to intentionally killing them in battle and elucidates both the warrior code of ethics and a soteriology for warriors represented in those discourses. Such discourses can be found in ethical teachings for warriors and narratives that feature a warrior (who was often the Buddha in a former life) as a protagonist.<sup>4</sup> As their full texts and translations that I provide in the footnotes show, these Buddhist discourses, which teach moderate measures for facing military confrontations, are not actually concrete, detailed manuals for use in implementing those measures. In those discourses, the explanations of the measures are concise and vague and are often more religious than tactically pragmatic. The most likely compilers of those discourses were monks, who were religious specialists and not military strategists or tacticians. The discourses are presented as religious ones in the form of discourses on military actions; they provide rough teachings about how to behave during military confrontation, while simultaneously espousing both a code of ethics and a soteriology for warriors who must face military confrontations.

All the Buddhist texts that are examined in this paper were written sometime between the third century BCE and the seventh century CE thereabouts (which I call the “ancient age” for conciseness)<sup>5</sup> on the Indian subcontinent or in Sri Lanka. The Pāli scriptures, for which the exact compilation dates are unknown, were compiled before the fifth century CE. I have also used Indian Classic scriptures outside Buddhism, particularly Kauṭilya’s book of statecraft, the *Arthaśāstra* (c. first century BCE–third century CE),<sup>6</sup> for comparison to clarify the peculiarity of the Buddhist discourses in question.

In other words, this paper explores Buddhist conceptions of the warrior who does not kill in war. The ultimate ideal of such a warrior is the wheel-turner (*cakkavatti/cakravartin*), an ideal monarch who conquers and rules the world without killing anyone, in accordance with *dhamma/dharma* (“the righteousness”). However, this paper focuses on cases of kings or other warriors who cannot become wheel-turners. As I argued in (2020), according to the Buddhist scriptures that expound the wheel-turner, such as the *Cakkavattisihanādasutta* (“Wheel-turner’s Lion’s Roar Sutta”) and Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* (“Treasury of Abhidharma,” both its *kārikā*, “verses,” and *bhāṣya*, “commentary,” fourth–fifth centuries), a king can become a wheel-turner only in an age when all people, if they fall

<sup>3</sup> I previously published a paper that investigates one of the second set of instructions found in the Mahāyāna *Satyakaparivarta* and related texts (Sugiki 2020). In that paper, I also mentioned many previous studies on the second set of instructions (by Schmithausen, Zimmermann, Gethin, Jenkins, Jamspal, and others), which I consider to be important.

<sup>4</sup> One may criticize using the latter kind of discourses as follows: although ethical teachings for warriors (i.e., teachings from a code of ethics given to kings and other warriors regarding how they should conduct themselves in fulfilling their respective social roles) are most likely to have been developed specifically for warrior listeners, narratives that feature a warrior as a protagonist were not necessarily taught to warriors. However, I attach importance to the aspect that warriors were not explicitly excluded; rather, they counted as listeners of the narratives as well as monks and lay devotees belonging to other social strata. Most of the protagonist warriors in these narratives are morally good and exemplary; they appear to be the most appealing to warriors. In fact, a narrative of exemplary kings (a monkey king and a human king) in Āryaśūra’s *Jātakamālā* (27: *Mahākapijātaka*) explicitly states that this narrative should be recited when preaching to a king in order to teach him to be as compassionate as the protagonist kings (particularly the monkey king). (*Jātakamālā*, Skt ed. (Vaidya 1959a), 27 (the ending passage): ... *vācyaṃ* / ... *rājāvavāde ca / evaṃ rājñā prajāsu dayāpannena bhavitavyam* / ... : “[This narrative] is to be spoken ... also when teaching to a king, [with the words,] ‘In the same way a king should be compassionate to [his] people,’ ...”).

<sup>5</sup> In Indian historiography, the six and seventh centuries CE are often classified as belonging to the “early medieval age” and not the “ancient age.” In this paper, “ancient age” means the “ancient and early medieval ages.” The seventh century CE is also a key age in the history of Buddhism. In the seventh century CE, King Harṣa’s Vardhana Dynasty rose and fell, after which Buddhism underwent further decline in South Asia, except in the eastern part of the Indian subcontinent and Nepal (where Buddhist Tantrism or Vajrayāna rose and flourished) as well as in Sri Lanka. I do not use Vajrayāna texts in this paper.

<sup>6</sup> For the date of compilation of the *Arthaśāstra*, see (Olivelle 2013, pp. 25–31).

short of perfection, voluntarily conduct themselves righteously and are therefore able to live to be 80,000 (or more) years old. In such a golden age of *dharma*, since kings in foreign countries are also moral, they do not aspire to fight in battle; instead, they follow the wheel-turner, who is the most righteous ruler. The wheel-turner is therefore able to conquer the world without killing in battle.<sup>7</sup> However, ancient India (and perhaps all ages in the real world) was not morally utopian. People often did not act righteously, and armed conflicts involving killing frequently broke out. In this paper, I explore Buddhist thoughts on how warriors could refrain from killing in war in a morally imperfect age.

Jenkins and Keown discussed some aspects of the Buddhist ideas about how to settle problems with armed opponents without killing. Although Jenkin's analysis is brief and undetailed, he pointed out that the *Jātakas* frequently refer to capturing enemies alive and intimidation as measures for subduing the enemy without bloodshed.<sup>8</sup> Keown examined the role of military deterrence in peace-building, using the discourse on the wheel-turner in the *Cakkavattisihanādasutta*, who, with his huge, strong fourfold army, conquers foreign kings without bloodshed.<sup>9</sup>

These studies are significant but insufficient. Keown did not fully consider the moral status of a world in which a king may become a wheel-turner, as I mentioned earlier. Consequently, he deemed the wheel-turner's bloodless conquest to be an effect of the deterrence by his huge army. However, it is, in fact, an effect of a mutual coupling of the wheel-turner's virtue and the foreign kings' morality in the *Cakkavattisihanādasutta*. It is not that the wheel-turner's huge army exerts a negative impact that causes foreign kings to become fearful or resigned.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, capturing enemies alive and employing intimidation strategies, as Jenkins pointed out, in addition to military deterrence (which I treat, in this paper, as a result of a king's virtue), as Keown argued, do not constitute all the measures for settling military problems without bloodshed. Buddhist scriptures teach more.

Furthermore, as discussed below, most of the measures are taught explicitly in connection with the precept against killing or warriors' own wish to avoid killing. Given that the precept against killing, the first of the Buddhist Five Precepts, has soteriological significance,<sup>11</sup> one should not understand the bloodless measures to have been presented merely for justifying particular forms of military conduct; they were also composed as a soteriological means for a warrior to avoid accruing the negative karmic retribution that intentional killing normally produces. Previous studies have not fully considered the soteriological aspect.<sup>12</sup> One must explore the ethical implications of those discourses with careful consideration of this aspect.

Buddhist measures by which a warrior can face problems in confrontation with armed opponents without killing can be divided into three types:

<sup>7</sup> For details, see (Sugiki 2020, pp. 4–7). There are four or five types of wheel-turners. What I call a “wheel-turner” here does not include the *balacakravartin* or the “forceful (or armed) wheel-turner,” which refers to a type of wheel-turner that a king can become in ages, such as that of ancient India, when people are not always moral and hence have shorter lifespans; this type of wheel-turner conquers and rules only one fourth of the world (one of the four continents) and sometimes kills his opponents in order to achieve this, according to the *Aśokāvadāna*. In the *Aśokāvadāna*, King Aśoka, the third emperor of the Maurya Dynasty, was a forceful wheel-turner. (For details about the forceful [or armed] wheel-turner in the *Aśokāvadāna*, see (Sugiki 2020, p. 7).) In the present paper, I examine the narrative of King Aśoka's life, as it is told in the *Aśokāvadāna*, as well as the narratives of other kings who could not become wheel-turners.

<sup>8</sup> (Jenkins 2010, p. 67).

<sup>9</sup> (Keown 2014, particularly pp. 666–69).

<sup>10</sup> Keown's interpretation of the wheel-turner in the *Cakkavattisihanādasutta* largely depends on his interpretation of the commentary and his policy of being a realist, rather than the actual content of the *Cakkavattisihanādasutta*.

<sup>11</sup> For example, see the well-known verse in the *Dhammapada* (129–32: I have used Fronsdal's translation (Fronsdal 2006, pp. 35–36): “All tremble at violence; All fear death. Seeing others as being like yourself, do not kill or cause others to kill. All tremble at violence; Life is dear for all. Seeing others as being like yourself, do not kill or cause others to kill. If, desiring happiness, you use violence to harm living beings who desire happiness, you won't find happiness after death. If, desiring happiness, you do not use violence to harm living beings who desire happiness, you will find happiness after death.”

<sup>12</sup> See (Sugiki 2020, p. 3 and footnote 10) for some of the important previous studies on Indian Buddhist statecraft in general. Keown (2014), which, from the perspective of this paper, is one of the most important previous studies, also examines Buddhist discourse on the wheel-turner from the “justification” perspective (“This article proposes that military deterrence can be a legitimate Buddhist strategy for peace.” (Keown 2014, p. 656 (abstract))) but does not fully attend to its soteriological aspect.

Type 1: Retreat from the role of warrior;

Type 2: Resolution without fighting in a pitched battle;

Type 3: Fighting in a pitched battle without killing.

They can be further divided into several subtypes.<sup>13</sup> Type 1 is distinct from Types 2 and 3 in terms of whether a warrior maintains the warrior role that was given to him. Meanwhile, Types 1 and 2 are distinguished from Type 3 in terms of whether a warrior fights in a pitched battle. In this paper, a “pitched battle” (*yuddha*) means a situation in which opposing armies meet, clash, and attack each other, regardless of the army’s relative sizes; however, the term does not refer to situations in which the physical clash between both sides has not actually started, such as a circumstance where one side shoots arrows at the other from a distance for intimidation purposes only. Dividing the types in this way is the most faithful to the texts.

The sections that follow in this paper are organized as follows. Sections 2–4 discuss the abovementioned Types 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Section 5 compares the Buddhist measures with similar measures found in the *Arthaśāstra* in order to clarify the ideology that underlies the Buddhist discourses. The Conclusion summarizes the discussion and clarifies the discourses as ethical and soteriological instructions for warriors.

## 2. Type 1: Retreat from the Role of Warrior

One measure by which a warrior can refrain from killing others in battle is to abandon the status of warrior and become a renouncer; as a renouncer, he is permanently freed from his duty to fight.<sup>14</sup> The *Mahāvagga* (“Large Part”) in the *Khandaka* book in the *Vinayaṭīkā* (“The Discipline Division [of the Pāli Canon]”) contains a story about royal warriors who abandoned their positions in the royal army and became Buddhist monks. The royal warriors say, ‘Really, delighted in battle, we go to [battle] and do a sinful deed. We produce many evils. Really, in what way can we be released from the sinful deed and do a good deed?’ and ‘If we can become monks among the Buddhist monks, we can likewise (like the monks) be released from the sinful deed and do a good deed.’ It is obvious that the royal warriors abandoned their roles in order to be released from the requirement, per their social role, to commit the sinful deed of warfare.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> I do not mean this list to be exhaustive. Other types and measures might be found in ancient Buddhist scriptures that have not been fully investigated. However, this paper covers more types and measures than the previous studies mentioned earlier.

<sup>14</sup> As is well-known, Siddhattha or Siddhārtha, the founder of Buddhism, was originally a royal prince, who left his court and became a renouncer to attain salvation. Buddhist scriptures, particularly the *Jātakas*, contain narratives of the lives of kings, princes, and warriors who abandoned their warrior status to become monks. Many of these narratives mention their motivations for becoming monks. However, some of the reasons are mentioned only briefly and are obscure, and of the reasons that are explicitly described, most do not have much to do with warfare. For example, *Makhādevajātaka* (“Makhādeva Jātaka,” JA 9), P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), p. 138, l. 20–l. 24 (in which the king decided to become a renouncer because he grew old and gray-haired); *Kumbhakārajātaka* (“Potter Jātaka,” JA 408), P ed., PTS, JA iii (Fausboll 1883), pp. 375–83 (in which the king decided to become a renouncer because the lay life was no longer attractive to him); and *Gandhārajātaka* (“Gandhāra Jātaka,” JA 406), P ed., PTS, JA iii (Fausboll 1883), p. 364, l. 22–l. 28 (in which the king decided to become a renouncer because he did not wish to lose his inner light due to the worldly desires that might consume him during his kingship) and p. 365, l. 6 (in which the king decided to become a renouncer because a friend of his, a fellow king, had already become a renouncer). It is only the royal warrior narrative in the *Mahāvagga* in the *Vinayaṭīkā* that explicitly states that the warriors became monks because they wanted to be freed from the duty of fighting in battle. Therefore, I will turn to an examination of the narrative in the *Vinayaṭīkā* below. Among the scriptures that are examined in this paper, the *Ghatajātaka* presents a story of Prince Ghata (the Buddha in a former life), who became a renouncer (Section 3, Footnote 33). However, the text does not explain why he became a renouncer. For this reason, I do not discuss his story as presented in the *Ghatajātaka* in Section 2 in this paper.

<sup>15</sup> In this footnote and the footnotes that follow, I have underlined the original words in the South Asian languages, the translations of which are quoted in the main text in quotation marks. *Vinayaṭīkā*, P ed., PTS, Vin i (Oldenberg 1879), *Khandaka*, *Mahāvagga*, 1.40.2 (p. 73, l. 26–l. 37): ... *atha kho abhiññātānaṃ abhiññātānaṃ yodhānaṃ etad ahoṣi: mayaṃ kho yuddhābhinandino gacchantā pāpaṃ ca karoma bahuṃ ca apuññaṃ pasavāma / kena nu kho mayaṃ upāyena pāpā ca vira meyyāma kalyāṇaṃ ca kareyyāma* ‘ti / *atha kho tesāṃ yodhānaṃ etad ahoṣi: ime kho samaṇā sakyaputtiyā dhammacārino samacārino brahmacārino saccavādino silavanto kalyāṇadhammā / sace kho mayaṃ samaṇesu sakyaputtiyesu pabbajeyyāma, evaṃ mayaṃ pāpā ca virameyyāma kalyāṇaṃ ca kareyyāma* ‘ti / *atha kho te yodhā bhikkhū upasaṃkamitvā pabbajjāṃ*

As is well known, the abovementioned story is part of a narrative that explains why the Buddha prohibited monks from ordaining royal warriors as monks—on the premise that if warriors left, kings would be furious, possibly to the point of killing or injuring monks, who ordained the warriors. The Buddha proclaimed any monk who ordained a royal warrior as a monk to be guilty of the *dukkata* offence (the “evil deed” offence, which is one of the lightest in monastic law).<sup>16</sup> After this rule was established, royal warriors had few chances to become monks. However, the rule did not apply to a warrior who did not officially belong to any royal army,<sup>17</sup> and it is also noteworthy that Buddhist scriptures contain many narratives of the lives of kings, princes, and other warriors who abandoned their warrior status to become monks.<sup>18</sup>

### 3. Type 2: Resolution without Fighting in a Pitched Battle

Another measure by which a king or a warrior could refrain from killing his opponents in war is to resolve problems with his challengers in moderate ways that do not include resorting to fighting in a pitched battle. Many discourses can be classified as belonging to this type. They can be grouped according to eight derived measures.

The first measure entails a warrior surrendering to or fleeing from the invading enemy without fighting. In the *Seyyajāṭaka* (“Excellent [Man] Jātaka”), when the enemy king’s army was approaching, the king of Bārāṇasī (the Buddha in a former life), who observed the precept (*śīlaṃ rakkhati*), said to his retainers, ‘For me there is no use [having] a kingdom [if it has been] acquired (defended) by harming others. Do not do anything!’ The king then gave his kingdom to the enemy king without any resistance.<sup>19</sup> A similar story of a king’s surrender can be found in the *Mahāsīlavajāṭaka* (“Great Silava Jātaka”). When the king of Kosala’s army was approaching to take Bārāṇasī, King Silava (also called the Great Silava, another former life of the Buddha) in Bārāṇasī, who was called “the righteous dhamma king” (*dhammiko dhammarājā*), said to his retainer warriors, ‘O friends! It is not the duty of the others (subjects) to languish for me. Let those who want the kingdom take the kingdom! Do not

---

*yācimsu / te bhikkhū pabbājesuṃ upasampādesuṃ* // ((King Bimbisāra commanded his army troops to march in battle, but some warriors, who were members of the army troops, did not wish to join the battle.) “Now, this [thought] occurred to the well-known warriors, ‘Really, delighted in battle, we go to [battle] and do a sinful deed. We produce many evils. Really, in what way can we be released from the sinful deed and do a good deed?’ Then, this [thought] occurred to those warriors, ‘Really, these Buddhist monks are practitioners of dhamma, practitioners of tranquility, and practitioners of chastity; they speak the truth, observe moral precepts, and [are endowed with] virtuous qualities. If we can become monks among the Buddhist monks, we can likewise be released from the sinful deed and do a good deed.’ Then, those warriors came to the monks and asked to be ordained. The monks ordained them as monks.”)

<sup>16</sup> *Vinayapiṭaka*, P ed., PTS, Vin i (Oldenberg 1879), *Khandaka, Mahāvagga*, 1.40.4 (p. 74, l. 14–l. 25): *santi bhante rājāno assaddhā appasannā, te appamattakena pi bhikkhū vihettheyyūṃ / sādhu bhante ayyā rājabhaṭaṃ na pabbājeyyūṃ ti / ... atha kho bhagavā etasmim nīdāne etasmim pakaraṇe dhammikathaṃ katvā bhikkhū āmantesi: na bhikkhave rājabhaṭo pabbājetabbo / yo pabbājeyya, āpatti dukkaṭassā ‘ti* // ((King Bimbisāra’s chief officers (*mahāmatta*) became furious and told him that monks who had ordained the royal soldiers as monks should be punished by death or amputation. Therefore, King Bimbisāra came to the Buddha and prayed to him thus:) “O Lord! There are kings [who are] neither devotional nor faithful. They would hurt monks even for a trifling [matter]. Good, O Lord! Noble ones (monks) should not ordain a royal soldier as a monk.’ ... Then, for this reason and on this occasion, the Lord [Buddha] preached the law and addressed the monks, ‘O monks, do not ordain a royal soldier as a monk. Should you ordain [him] as a monk, [you are guilty of] the *dukkata* offence.’”

<sup>17</sup> For example, the *Aśokāvadāna* contains a short story about a warrior named Bhadrāyudha, who served Susīma, the rival brother of Aśoka, as a retainer. After Susīma was defeated and killed in battle, Bhadrāyudha, having lost his royal master, became a monk and finally attained the state of Arhat (*Aśokāvadāna*, Skt ed. (Mukhopadhyaya 1963), p. 42, l. 10–l. 11). Chronologically, Aśoka was active at a later time than the Buddha, who prohibited monks from ordaining a royal warrior as a monk.

<sup>18</sup> See Footnote 14 in this paper.

<sup>19</sup> *Seyyajāṭaka* (JA 282), P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), p. 401, l. 10–l. 14: “*deva asuko nāma kira rājā ‘bārāṇasīrajjam gaṇhissāmīti’ janapadam bhindanto āgacchati, etth’ eva naṃ gantvā gaṇhissāmā ‘ti āhaṃsu. ‘mayham paravihiṃsāya laddhena rajjena kiccaṃ n’ atthi, mā kiñci karitthā’ ‘ti.*” ([In Bārāṇasī the great warriors (*mahāyodhā*)] said, ‘O king! Destroying countries, a king named such and such [with his army] is now coming [with the thought] “I will take over the kingdom of Bārāṇasī.” Now, let us go and capture him.’ [The king replied], ‘For me there is no use [having] a kingdom [if it has been] acquired (defended) by harming others. Do not do anything!’”) The phrase “observed the precept” (*śīlaṃ rakkhati*, literally “observes the precept”) appears in p. 400, l. 28–p. 401, l. 1. See (Maeda 1982, pp. 286–87) for translation. See also (Jenkins 2010, p. 67) and (Keown 2014, p. 674).



go [to counter them].<sup>20</sup> Similarly, the *Mahāvamsa* (“Great Chronicle”), a chronicle of kings in ancient Sri Lanka (fifth century CE), contains a story of King Siri Saṃghabodhi (active in the third century CE), who was an observer of the Five Precepts (*pañcasīlavā*). One day the king’s finance minister, Goṭhakābhaya, amassed rebel troops and marched on the capital where Saṃghabodhi resided to seize the throne. Having had prior knowledge of the coup, Saṃghabodhi fled (*palāyi*) the capital alone; he did not fight because he disliked harming others (*parahiṃsaṃ arocento*) in battle. As a result, Goṭhakābhaya ascended the throne.<sup>21</sup>

The three kings did not fight against their opponent invaders because of their desire to avoid killing, in accordance with the precept against killing.<sup>22</sup> However, in contrast to the Type 1 royal warriors who abandoned their roles, the three kings seem to have fulfilled their duty to protect their subjects, either by surrendering or fleeing. The texts do not say anything about the subjects meeting unhappy fates after the kings surrendered or fled, and, as discussed below, the kings in the *Seyyajāṭaka* and the *Mahāsīlavajāṭaka* later regained their kingdoms without bloodshed.<sup>23</sup>

The second measure is to be virtuous: a king resolves problems without resorting to fighting in battle thanks to the impact his virtue exerts upon his opponents.<sup>24</sup> According to the *Kūṭadantasutta* (“Kūṭadanta Sutta”), King Mahāvijita, who possesses all the kingly elements, such as a fourfold army that is allegiant and obedient to his command, ‘torments [his] enemies with the heat of [his] splendor.’<sup>25</sup> A similar idea can be found in the *Aśokāvadāna* (“Aśoka’s Legend,” c. second century CE),<sup>26</sup> which is a narrative of the life of King Aśoka (active in the third century BCE) in the Maurya Dynasty. Aśoka marched with his fourfold army, which was a supernatural manifestation resulting from his virtue (*kuśala*). The people in some cities welcomed Aśoka, and the gods commanded the people on the

<sup>20</sup> *Mahāsīlavajāṭaka* (JA 51), P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), pp. 263, l. 17–l. 21: ... “deva, kosalarājā kira ‘bārāṇasirajjaṃ gaṇhissāmūti’ āgacchati, gacchāma, naṃ amhakaṃ rajjasīmaṃ anokkantamattam eva pothetvā gaṇhāmā” ‘ti vadimsu. “tātā, maṃ niissāya aññesaṃ kilamanakiccaṃ n’atthi, rajjatthikā rajjaṃ gaṇhantu, mā gamitthā” ‘ti nivāresi. ([The warriors (yodhā)] said, ‘O king! The king of Kosala is now approaching [with the thought] “I will take over the kingdom of Bārāṇasi.” Let us go [to counter his army]. Let us beat and capture it so that [it] does not cross the border of our kingdom.’ [The king said], ‘O friends! It is not the duty of the others (subjects) to languish due to me. Let those who want the kingdom take the kingdom! Do not go [to counter them],’ and [thus he] stopped [the warriors]). The phrase “the righteous dhamma king” (*dhammiko dhammarājā*) appears in p. 262, l. 9.

<sup>21</sup> *Mahāvamsa*, P ed., PTS (Geiger 1908), 36.73 and 91–92: *rājā sirisaṃghabodhīti vissuto pañcasīlavā / anurādhapure rajjaṃ duve vassāni kārayi // ... so bhaṇḍāgāriko rañño amacco goṭhakābhayo / coro hutvā uttarato nagaraṃ samupāgami // parissāvanam ādāya rājā dakkhiṇadvārato / parahiṃsaṃ arocento ekako va palāyi so //* (“The king known as Siri (Glorious) Saṃghabodhi is an observer of the Five Precepts who governed a kingdom in Anurādhapura for two years....He, the king’s finance minister, Goṭhakābhaya, became a robber (a rebel seeking to seize the kingdom) and came [with his army troops] to the city [of Saṃghabodhi] from the north. Having held a water strainer, that king (Saṃghabodhi), [who] disliked harming others, fled alone from the south gate.”) See (Geiger and Bode 1912, p. 261 and p. 263) for translation. See also (Collins 1998, p. 459) and (Zimmermann 2006, pp. 222–23).

<sup>22</sup> In the story of King Silava, the king’s name, Silava (from *sīla*, “precept”), suggests, in combination with another appellation, namely the “righteous dhamma king,” that he is an observer of the precept against killing.

<sup>23</sup> The *Kāmajāṭaka* (“Desire Jātaka”) also includes a story about a king who surrendered to the enemy (the king’s older brother) without any resistance (*Kāmajāṭaka* (JA 467), P ed., PTS, JA iv (Fausboll 1887), p. 169, l. 20–p. 169, l. 26). However, in this story, the king surrendered because he was afraid he would be blamed for killing his brother (“However, if I kill him in war, I will be blamed. What is the use of kingship for me?” *sace kho paṇāmaṃ imaṃ yuddhena māressāmi garahā me bhavissati, kiṃ me rajjena*). It seems that surrender without resistance is a diplomatic policy that is accepted in Buddhism; however, it is not in all cases exclusively connected with the king’s wish to observe the precept against killing.

<sup>24</sup> Of the examples examined below, one may see possessing an excellent fourfold army in the *Kūṭadantasutta* and *Aśokāvadāna*, and having the benefit of the gods’ command in the *Aśokāvadāna* as forms of intimidation (the fourth way below); however, no word meaning “intimidation” is used in those texts.

<sup>25</sup> *Kūṭadantasutta* (DN 5), P ed., PTS, DN i (Rhys Davids and Carpenter 1890), p. 137, l. 14–l. 23: *rājā mahāvijito atthaṅgehi samannāgato ... balavā caturaṅginiyā senāya samannāgato assavāya ovādapatīkarāya patapati māñhe paccatthike yasasā, ...* (“King Mahāvijita is endowed with the eight limbs: ... (One of the limbs is that) he is powerful, possesses a fourfold army that is allegiant and obedient to [his] instruction, and, I guess, torments [his] enemies with the heat of [his] splendor, ...”). The word “*patapati*” (“warm” or “torment with heat”) is *sahati* (“conquer”) in the Sixth Council Burmese edition (P ed., Vipassana Research Institute (<https://www.tipitaka.org/>), the *Kūṭadantasutta*, 340 and 344. See also (Walshe 1987, p. 136) for translation.

<sup>26</sup> For the date of compilation of the *Aśokāvadāna*, see (Mukhopadhyaya 1963, p. ix) and (Strong 1983, pp. 26–27).

continent as whole not to oppose him.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, in the *Palāyijātaka* (“‘Fled’ Jātaka”), having witnessed the brilliance of the king of Takkaśilā’s (another former life of the Buddha) tower gate (*dvārakoṭṭhaka*), King Brahmadatta in Bārāṇasī retreated with his army, saying, ‘We will not be able to fight against the king, [who is] glorious in such a way (i.e., having such a brilliant tower gate).’<sup>28</sup> Moreover, in the aforementioned *Mahāsīlavajātaka*, with the aid of Yakkhas (Yakṣas, demons), the conquered King Sīlava snuck into the enemy king’s bedroom at night. Seeing this, the enemy king realized that Sīlava was so virtuous (*guṇa*) that even the cruel Yakkhas worked for him; he apologized to Sīlava and returned the kingdom to him.<sup>29</sup> The *Seyyajāṭaka*, which was examined earlier, tells the rest of the story as follows. The conquered king (the king of Bārāṇasī) was imprisoned, but he kept his thoughts about the enemy king merciful (*mettāyānto*). Due to the supernatural effect of his merciful meditation, the enemy king’s body grew hot and tormented. The enemy king was informed that his miserable physical state was punishment for imprisoning the precept-observing king (*sīlavantaṃ rājānaṃ*); he apologized to the king, released him, and returned the kingdom.<sup>30</sup> It seems that due to the imprisoned king’s observance of the precept, he was able to supernaturally affect the enemy king (i.e., heat his body) through his

<sup>27</sup> Aśokāvadāna, Skt ed. (Mukhopadhyaya 1963), p. 39, l. 3–p. 40, l. 5: *atha rājño bindusārasya takṣaśilā nāma nagaraṃ viruddham / tatra rājñā bindusāreṇa aśoko viśarjitaḥ / ... yadi mama rājyavaipākyam kuśalam asti sainyapraharaṇaṃ prādurbhavadu / evam ukte kumāreṇa prthivyām avakāśo datto devatābhiḥ sainyapraharaṇāni copanītāni / yāvāt kumāraś caturaṅgeṇa balakāyena takṣaśilāṃ gataḥ / ... na vāyam kumārasya viruddhā nāpi rājño bindusārasya / ... mahatā ca satkāreṇa takṣaśilāṃ praveśitaḥ / evam vistareṇa aśokaḥ khaṣarājyaṃ praveśitaḥ / ... devatābhiḥ ca cokaṃ / aśokaś caturbhāgacakraṇavartī bhaviṣyati / na kenacid virodhitavyam iti / vistareṇa yāvād ā samudrā prthivī ājñāpita /* (“Then, the [people in the] city named Takṣaśilā rebelled against King Bindusāra. King Bindusāra sent Aśoka there, ... ‘If my merit is such that I am to become a king, may troops and weapons appear!’ When the prince (Aśoka) had spoken thus, the earth opened up, and deities brought forth troops and weapons. When the prince arrived at Takṣaśilā with the fourfold army, ... [the people of Takṣaśilā said to him] ‘We did not rebel against the prince, nor even against King Bindusāra, ...’ And with great hospitality, [Aśoka] was welcomed into Takṣaśilā. In the same way Aśoka was wholly welcomed into the kingdom of the Khaṣas.... And the gods proclaimed: ‘Aśoka is to become a wheel-turner [who rules] one of the four [continents]; no one is to oppose [him]!’ The earth, as far as the ocean, was wholly commanded.”) See also (Strong 1983, p. 208) for translation.

<sup>28</sup> *Palāyijātaka* (JA 229), P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), p. 218, l. 11–l. 18: ... *iti so rājā gajjitoṇ senaṃ vicāretvā nagaradvārasamīpaṃ gantvā dvārakoṭṭhakaṃ disvā “idaṃ rājño vasaṇagehaṃ” ti pucchitoṇ “ayaṃ nagaradvāraṇakoṭṭhako” ti vutte “nagaradvāraṇakoṭṭhako tāva evarūpo rājño nivesanaṃ kidisaṃ bhavissatīti” vavvā “vejayantapāsādasadisaṃ” ti sutvā “evaṃ yasasampannena rājñā saddhiṃ yujjhituṃ na sakhiṣṣamā” ti dvārakoṭṭhakaṃ disvā va nivattitoṇ palāyitoṇ bārāṇasim eva āgamāsi.* (“That king (King Brahmadatta in Bārāṇasī) roared thus, commanded the army, went near the city gate, and looked at the tower gate. He asked, ‘Is this the residence of the king (the king of Takkaśilā, the Buddha in his former life)?’ ‘This is a tower gate of the city [and not the king’s residence].’ Having been told [thus], he said, ‘The tower gate of the city is of such great appearance. What will the king’s residence be like?’ ‘[It is] like [Indra’s] Vejayaṇta palace.’ Having heard [this], [he said], ‘We will not be able to fight against the king, [who is] glorious in such a way.’ [Then,] having only seen the tower gate, he turned, ran away, and went back to Bārāṇasī.”) See also (Maeda 1982, p. 107) for translation. See also (Jenkins 2010, p. 67).

<sup>29</sup> *Mahāsīlavajātaka* (JA 51), P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), p. 266, l. 27–p. 267, l. 7: *taṃ sutvā corarājā saṃviggamānaso “mahārāja, ahaṃ manussabhūto pi samāno tumhākaṃ guṇaṃ na jānāmi, paresaṃ lohitamaṃsakhādakehi pana kakkhalehi pharusehi yakkhehi tava guṇā nātā, na dān’ ahaṃ narinda evarūpe silasampanne taya dubbhissamīti” khaggaṃ ādāya sapaṭhaṃ katvā rājānaṃ khamāpetvā mahāsayane nipajjāpetvā attanā khuddakamañcake nipajjitoṇ pabhātāya rattiyā utthite suriye bheriṇ carāpetvā sabbaseṇiyo ca amaccabrāhmaṇagahapatike ca sannipātāpetvā tesam purato ākāse puṇṇacandaṃ ukkhipanto viya sīlavaraṇiṇo guṇe kathetvā parisamajjhe yeva puna rājānaṃ khamāpetvā rājyaṃ paṭicchāpetvā ...* (“Having heard that (viz., the way King Mahāsīlava entered the king of Kosala’s bedroom, which was carefully guarded), the robber king (viz., the king of Kosala) trembled with fear [and said,] ‘O great king! Although I was born as a human too, I did not know your virtue. However, Yakkhas, eaters of others’ blood and flesh, cruel, and violent, know your virtues. O human king, now (from now on), I will not be hostile to you, [you] of such nature and [who is] perfect in precepts.’ [Then,] he took a sword and made a vow. Having apologized to the king, he made [the king] sleep on a big bed and he himself slept on a small bed. At dawn, after a night, when the sun rose, having had the drum beaten, he gathered all the troops of [his] courts, brahmins, and *gahapati* or property-owners, and in their presence, as if raising a full moon in the sky, he recited King Sīlava’s virtues. In the midst of the audience, he apologized to the king again, and returned the kingdom ...”) See also (Fujita 1984, p. 309) for translation.

<sup>30</sup> *Seyyajāṭaka* (JA 282), P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), p. 401, l. 21–p. 402, l. 3: *rājā bandhanāgāre nisimmo va corarājānaṃ mettāyānto mettajjhānaṃ uppādesi. tassa mettānubhāvena corarājño kāye dāho uppajji, sakalasarīraṃ yamakaukkāhi jhāpiyamānaṃ viya jātaṃ, so mahādukkhaṇhitunno “kin nu kho kāraṇaṃ” ti pucchi. “tumhe sīlavantaṃ rājānaṃ bandhanāgāre khipāpetha, tena vo idaṃ dukkhaṃ uppannaṃ bhavissatīti.” so gantvā bodhisattaṃ khamāpetvā “tumhākaṃ rājyaṃ tumhākaṃ eva hotu” ti rājyaṃ tass’ eva niyyādetvā “ito paṭṭhāya tumhākaṃ paccatthikā mayhaṃ bhārā” ti vavvā dutṭhāmacassa rājānaṃ karitvā attano nagaraṃ eva gato.* (“In prison, the [conquered] king (the Buddha in his former life) was just sitting; being merciful to the robber king (the enemy king), he attained the meditation of mercy. By the power of his mercy, the robber king’s body was heated as if his entire body was being burnt by two torches. He was overwhelmed by great pain and asked, ‘Why on earth?’ [Someone answered], ‘You let [your retainer] cast the moral king into prison. This pain must have occurred just because of that.’ He (the robber king) went to the bodhisatta (the conquered king) and apologized to [him]. ‘Your kingdom must belong only to you.’ [Having said] so, [the robber king] returned the kingdom to him. ‘From now, your enemies are in my charge.’

meditative mercy. Similar stories of a king who exerted the same supernatural effect thanks to his meditation can be found in the two texts that are discussed in the next paragraph. However, they have a different element, viz., preaching.

The third measure is to preach: a king talks to his enemy about impermanence, kingship, and other related topics, causing the enemy to regret his actions and retreat. The *Maṇikuṇḍalajātaka* (“Jeweled Earing Jātaka”) tells a story about a king of Bārāṇasī (another former life of the Buddha), who was conquered and imprisoned by the king of Kosala. In jail, the king of Bārāṇasī was intent on meditating, which caused the king of Kosala’s body to grow very hot.<sup>31</sup> The king of Kosala came to the jail to see the king of Bārāṇasī. From inside his prison, the king of Bārāṇasī told the king of Kosala that because he understood the impermanence (*asassata*) of all things, he personally never grieved the loss (confiscation) of wealth. In addition, he instructed his captor as follows: ‘O king, glory and fame increase for [the one] whose actions are considerate.’ The king of Kosala apologized to the king of Bārāṇasī, released him, and returned the kingdom.<sup>32</sup> The *Ghatajātaka* (“Ghata Jātaka”) includes a similar story about another royal man, Prince Ghata (another former life of the Buddha), who told his enemy king that grief could not help him and that nothing can bring pleasure to someone who is dissatisfied with his own existence and who seeks to take all the things he desires.<sup>33</sup>

---

Having said so, he punished the evil minister and went back to his own country.”) See (Maeda 1982, p. 287) for translation. See also (Jenkins 2010, p. 67) and (Keown 2014, p. 674).

<sup>31</sup> However, the *Maṇikuṇḍalajātaka* does not explain exactly what meditation the imprisoned king performed. (See Footnote 32 in this paper.) Meanwhile, in the *Seyyajāataka*, as previously mentioned, the imprisoned king meditated deeply by keeping his mind merciful.

<sup>32</sup> *Maṇikuṇḍalajātaka* (JA 351), P ed., PTS, JA iii (Fausboll 1883), p. 153, l. 7–p. 155, l. 3: *idhāpi bodhisatto bārāṇasiyaṃ rājā ahoṣi. duṭṭhāmacco kosalarājānaṃ ānetvā kāsiraṇṇaṃ gāhāpetvā bandhanāgāre pāpesi. rājā jhānaṃ uppādetvā ākāse pallaṃke nisīdi. corarañño sarīre dāho uppajji. so bārāṇasirājānaṃ upasaṃkamitvā paṭhamāṃ gāthāṃ \*āha (āha)—\*jīno rathassamaṇikuṇḍalā ca, putte ca dāre ca tath’ eva jīno / (incorrect gender, number, and case) sabbesu bhogesu asesitesu, kasmā na santappasi sokakāle ti / taṃ sutvā bodhisatto imā dve gāthā abhāsi—pubbe va maccaṃ vijahanti bhogā, macco ca ne pubbataraṃ jahāti / asassatā bhogino kāmakāmi, tasmā na socāmi’ ahaṃ sokakāle // udeti āpūraṇi veti cando, atthaṃ tapetvāna paleti suriyo / viditā mayā sattuka lokadhammā, tasmā na socāmi’ ahaṃ sokakāle ti / evaṃ mahāsatto corarañño dhammaṃ desetvā idāni tass’ evācāraṃ parigaṇhanto—alaso gihī kāmabhogī nā sādhu, asaṇṇāto pabbajito na sādhu / rājā na sādhu anisammakārī, yo paṇḍito kodhano taṃ na sādhu // nisamma khattiyo kayirā nānisamma disampati / nisammakārino rāja yaso kitti ca vaḍḍhatīti / āha bodhisattaṃ khamāpetvā rājāṃ paṭicchāpetvā attano janapadaṃ eva gato.* (“Here, again, the bodhisatta was the king of Bārāṇasī. An evil minister influenced the king of Kosala, let [him] take over the kingdom of Kāsi (Bārāṇasī), and imprisoned [the king of Bārāṇasī]. [In prison,] the king [of Bārāṇasī] started a meditation and sat in the cross-legged posture. A heat arose in the body of the robber king (viz., the king of Kosala, who robbed the king of the Bārāṇasī kingdom). He came to the king of Bārāṇasī and recited the first verse: ‘Chariots, horses, jewels, and earrings were taken. [Your] sons and wives were also taken. At [this] time of grief, when all [your] fortunes [have been taken] without exception, why do you not grieve?’ Having heard that, the bodhisatta recited these two verses: ‘Fortunes abandon a human before [a human abandons them] (i.e., a human may lose his fortunes before he departs from them by death or for other reasons), and a human abandons them before [they abandon a human]. O you very greedy one, fortunes are not permanent. Therefore, I do not grieve at [this] time of grief.’” [He continued,] “‘The moon rises, becomes full, and sets. Having heated things, the sun sets. O [you] enemy, I know the law (*dhamma*) of the world. Therefore, I do not grieve at [this] time of grief.’ Having thus taught the robber king the truth (*dhamma*), thereupon, the great one (the king of Bārāṇasī) examined his conduct and recited [these verses]: ‘[If] a layperson is lazy and enjoys desire, [it is] not good. [If] a renouncer is not restrained, [it is] not good. [If] a king does not act considerately, [it is] not good. If a scholar is easily angered, it is not good. A man of royal class should act considerately. A king [should] not be inconsiderate. O king, glory and fame increase for [the one] whose actions are considerate.’ [The king of Kosala] apologized to the bodhisatta, returned the kingdom [to him], and went back to his own country (*janapada*, Kosala).” See also (Matsumura and Matsuda 1988, pp. 160–61) for translation.

<sup>33</sup> *Ghatajātaka* (JA 355), P ed., PTS, JA iii (Fausboll 1883), p. 168, l. 21–p. 170, l. 13. The preach is as follows (p. 169, l. 10–17 [verses 30–33]): *nābhatītaḥaro soko nānāgatasukhāvaho / tasmā vaṃka na socāmi n’ atthi soke dutiyyatā // socaṃ paṇḍukisīhoti bhattaṇ c’ assa na ruccati / amittā sumanā honti sallaviddhassa ruppato // gāme vā yadi vāraññe nīne vā yadi vā thale / na man taṃ āgamissati evaṃ diṭṭhapado ahaṃ // yass’ attā nālam eko sabbakāmarasāhāro / sabbāpi paṭhavī tassa na sukhaṃ āvahissatīti* / (“Grief does not bring back the past. [It does] not bring the future pleasure [here]. So, O Vaṃka (the enemy king), I do not grieve. Grief does not help. Grieving, one becomes pale and thin, and he is not fond of food. Enemies are pleased with those hit by arrows and afflicted. In a village, a forest, a low place, or a high place, whichever [place I might be], that (grief) will not come to me. I see the foot-step (path) in this way. Even the [attainment of the] whole earth will not bring pleasure to the one who is not satisfied only with [his] own being and [who seeks to] take all desired tastes.”) See also (Matsumura and Matsuda 1988, pp. 173–74) for translation. The text states that Prince Ghata attained rebirth in heaven (Brahman’s world). However, this occurred more directly because he became a renouncer and devoted himself to meditation. *Ghatajātaka* (JA 355), P ed., PTS, JA iii (Fausboll 1883), p. 170, l. 11–13: *mahāsatto pi rājāṃ amaccānaṃ niyyādetvā himavāntapadesaṃ gantvā pabbajitvā aparihīnājjhāno brahmalokaparāyano ahoṣi.* (“The great one (Prince Ghata, the Buddha in a former life) also entrusted the kingdom to [his] ministers, went to the Himalayan district, became a renouncer, [completely immersed himself in] meditation, and attained rebirth in Brahman’s world.”) See also (Matsumura and Matsuda 1988, p. 174) for translation.



The fourth measure is intimidation: a king or warrior intimidates his enemy using words, weapons, or his alliance with other countries, so that the enemy abandons the fight and retreats. In the *Dutiyaṭpalāyijātaka* (“The Second ‘Fled’ Jātaka”), showing his moon-like face, the king of Bārāṇasī (another former life of the Buddha) intimidated the king of Gandhāra, who had come with his army to take Bārāṇasī, by saying, ‘Now, I will crush your soldiers and vehicles just like an excellent elephant, [which is] intoxicated, [crushes] a forest of reeds.’ The king of Gandhāra was frightened and ran away.<sup>34</sup> Espousing a similar theme, several Buddhist scriptures contain the narrative of the furious king Virūḍhaka’s destruction of the Śākyas, the Buddha’s kinsmen. There are different versions of this narrative, but the version in Zhi Qian’s (third century CE) Chinese translation of the *Arthapadasūtra* (義足經 or *Yizujing*, “Footstep of Meaning Sūtra”) is perhaps the oldest.<sup>35</sup> It tells that before Virūḍhaka’s army reached the Śākyas’ stronghold, the Śākya warriors, having seen the invaders from a distance, hit their chariots and the soldiers’ ornaments very precisely with arrows. The Śākya warriors did this to intimidate Virūḍhaka into abandoning the battle; because the Śākyas observed the Five Precepts, they had no intention of killing their opponents.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, in the *Asadisajātaka* (“Asadisa Jātaka”), Prince Asadisa of Bārāṇasī (another former life of the Buddha) used his skill in archery to intimidate seven kings who marched with their armies to take Bārāṇasī. From a remote sentry tower, Asadisa hit the seven kings’ golden dish with his arrow while the kings were having a meal; naturally, the kings were frightened and ran away. The text says, ‘The great one (Prince Asadisa) thus made the seven kings run away without causing the shedding of as much blood as a gadfly sucks.’ Intimidation by use of an arrow is thus related here as a counterproposal to fighting (bloodshed) in battle.<sup>37</sup> The *Sudhanakumārāvadhāna* (“Legend of Prince Sudhana,” before the fifth to

<sup>34</sup> *Dutiyaṭpalāyijātaka* (JA 230), P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), p. 220, l. 7–p. 221, l. 2: *ath’ assa so punṇacandasassirikaṃ attano mukhaṃ dassetvā “bāla mā vippalapa, idāni te balavāhanaṃ mattavaravāraṇo viya naḷavanam viddhamsessāmīti” santajjetvā ... evaṃ tajjentassa pan’ assa kathaṃ sutvā gandhārārājā ullokeno kañcanapaṭṭasādisaṃ mahānalāṭaṃ diṣvā attano gahaṇabhīto nivattitvā palāyanto sakanagaram eva agamāsī.* (“Then, he (the king of Bārāṇasī, the Buddha in his former life) showed him (the king of Gandhāra) his own face, [which was] resplendent like a full moon, and frightened [him] with the words, ‘O [you] fool, do not talk nonsense. Now, I will crush your soldiers and vehicles just as an excellent elephant, [which is] intoxicated, [crushes] a forest of reeds.’ ... Having heard thus from him [who] caused fright in this way again, the king of Gandhāra looked up and saw [his] wide forehead like a golden plate. Afraid that he might be captured, he turned, ran away, and went back to his city (Gandhāra).”) See also (Maeda 1982, p. 109) for translation. See also (Jenkins 2010, p. 67).

<sup>35</sup> According to (Mizuno 1952, p. 87), the original Sanskrit title of this scripture is *Artha(ka)varga* or *Artha(ka)vargīya* (“Classes of Meanings [or Objects]”). Murakami (1996) presents a comparative study of the several versions of this narrative that have been preserved in Pāli (such as Buddhaghosa’s *Dhammapadāṭṭhakathā*), Chinese, and Sanskrit texts.

<sup>36</sup> *Arthapadasūtra*, T 198, p. 188c15–c23: 尚未相見。諸釋便引弓。以利刀箭射斷車。當應亦射斷車輓。亦射斷車轂。亦截車軸。射斷駟。亦射斷人身珠寶。無所傷害。舍國王恐怖。顧問左右。汝曹寧知諸釋已出城迎闕死。我曹終不得其勝不如早還。傍臣即白王言。我曹先已聞諸釋皆持五戒。盡形壽不犯。生至使當死。不敢有所傷害。有所傷害。為犯戒。但前自可得其勝。 (“[The army troops of Virūḍhaka, the king of Śrāvastī, and the Śākyas] did not meet each other [face to face] yet [when] the Śākyas drew bows, shot arrows with sharp points, and stopped the [moving] chariots [of Virūḍhaka’s army]. Soon, again [the Śākyas] shot [arrows] and cut the yokes of the chariots; [they] shot again and destroyed the wheel hubs and the axles; and [they] shot [again] and broke the chariot’s covers. [They] shot [yet] again and cut the pearls and jewels off the bodies of the people (in Virūḍhaka’s army), but [they] did not injure [them]. The king of Śrāvastī was very afraid; [he] looked around and asked [the retainers on his] left and right [sides], ‘How do you know? The Śākyas are already out of the castle [and] are coming to [us to] fight [with us] to the death. We will not win the [battle] in the end. It is best to retreat.’ Then, the retainers staying with [him], said to the king, ‘We heard [that] all of the Śākyas observe the Five Precepts; [they] do not transgress [them] until they die; and although life leads to death, [they] do not dare to injure [others]. When [they] injure [others], [it means that they] transgress the precept. Just move forward, and naturally, we can win the [battle].’)”) See also (Bapat 1951, pp. 168–69) for translation. See also (Kaji and Kenkyūkai 2019, p. 139).

<sup>37</sup> *Asadisajātaka* (JA 181), P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), p. 90, l. 16–l. 24: *“ahaṃ asadisakumāro āgato, ahaṃ ca ekaṃ kaṇḍaṃ khipanto sabbesaṃ vo jīvitaṃ harissāmi, jīvitaṃ atthikā palāyantū”ti aṭṭhake ṭhatvā sattannaṃ rājānaṃ bhuñjantānaṃ kañcanapātīmakule yeva kaṇḍaṃ patesi. te akkharāni diṣvā maraṇabhayaabhītā sabbe va palāyimsu. evaṃ mahāsatto khuddakamakkhikāya pivanamattam pi lohitaṃ anuppādetvā satta rājāno palāpetvā kaniṭṭhabhātaraṃ oloketvā kāme pahāya isipabbajjaṃ pabbajito abhiññā ca samāpattiyo ca nibbattetoṃ jīvitaṃ pariyoṣāne brahmalokūpago ahoṣi.* ((For the purpose of countering the seven kings, King Brahmadatta in Bārāṇasī called back Prince Asadisa, the Buddha in a former life, whom Brahmadatta had banished from Bārāṇasī.) ‘I, Prince Asadisa, have come [back]. If I shoot an arrow, I will take all of your lives. Those who desire to be alive should run away.’ [Having said] thus, he stood on the sentry tower, and hit the knob of the golden dish [upon which] the seven kings [were] eating with an arrow. Having seen the letters [on the arrow], they feared [their own] deaths, and all [of them] ran away. The great one (Prince Asadisa) thus made the seven kings run away without causing the shedding of as much blood as a gadfly sucks. Then, having looked at [his] younger brother (King Brahmadatta),

the seventh centuries thereabouts)<sup>38</sup> also mentions intimidation through the use of armed forces as a counterproposal to killing in battle. Prince Sudhana (another former life of the Buddha) was on an expedition to quell a rebellion. Having seen this, Vaiśravaṇa (a god) commanded Pāṇcika (the general of Yakṣas) to help Sudhana: ‘Having set out for the purpose of fighting in battle, this [Sudhana], the bodhisattva in the Fortunate Aeon, will experience pain. Help must be given to him. The local chief (rebel) must be subjugated. And yet no living being must be pained.’ Pāṇcika created a fourfold army comprised of celestial beings (e.g., a man as tall as a *tāla* tree); the army intimidated the rebel chief’s people with roaring sounds, the splendor of its supernatural troops, and the destruction of the rebel’s castle’s rampart. Although the rampart was roundly destroyed, no one was killed in this counterinsurgency campaign.<sup>39</sup> (Seen from Sudhana’s viewpoint, this is an application of the second measure: given Sudhana’s virtue as a bodhisattva, the gods helped subjugate the enemy without killing.) As mentioned below, the Mahāyāna *Satyakaparivarta* (“Chapter of Satyaka,” the fourth to sixth centuries) teaches that a righteous king (*chos dang ldan pa’i rgyal po*) can employ the strategy of intimidating (*jigs pa bstan pa*) his enemies into abandoning fighting by forming alliances with other countries.

The fifth and sixth measures are forming friendships with and giving gifts to one’s enemies, respectively. The *Satyakaparivarta* teaches three diplomatic policies to convince foreign opponents to abandon fighting before a pitched battle breaks out; they are to become friends (*mdza’ bar bgyi*

---

he abandoned worldly desires and left the house to become a renouncer. He attained the supernatural powers (*abhiññā*) and the state of meditative absorption (*samāpattiyo*) and, after death, he was reborn in the world of Brahman.”) See also (Tanabe 1987, p. 340) for translation. See also (Jenkins 2010, p. 67).

<sup>38</sup> I have used the version of the *Sudhanakumārāvadāna* that is found in the *Divyāvadāna* because the Sanskrit edition of this version is available to me. However, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* (the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* part) is the older scripture that includes the *Sudhanakumārāvadāna* (Hiraoka 2002, pp. 129–32 and Yao 2013, pp. 345–68). The oldest Sanskrit manuscript of the *Sudhanakumārāvadāna* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* (from Gilgit) was produced between about the fifth and seventh centuries (Yao 2013, p. xvi). Therefore, I have dated the compilation of the *Sudhanakumārāvadāna* before the fifth to seventh centuries thereabouts.

<sup>39</sup> *Sudhanakumārāvadāna* (*Divyāvadāna* 30), Skt ed. (Vaidya 1959b), p. 290, l. 13–p. 291, l. 1: *paśyati sudhanam kumāram / tasyaitad abhavat—ayam bhadralpiko bodhisattvaḥ khedam āpatsyati yuddhāyābhiprasthitaḥ / sāhāyīyam asya karanīyam / kārvaṭikāḥ saṁnā mayitavyaḥ / na ca kasyacit prāṇināḥ pīḍā karanīyeti viditvā pāṇcikaṁ mahāyākṣasenāpatim āmantrayate—ehi toam pāṇcika, sudhanasya kumārasya kārvaṭikam ayuddhena saṁnāmaya / na ca te kasyacit prāṇināḥ pīḍā kartaṇīyeti / tatheti pāṇcikenā yakṣasenāpatinā vaiśravaṇasya mahārājasya pratiśrutya divyaś caturaṅgo balakāyo nirmītaḥ—tālamātrapramāṇāḥ puruṣaḥ, parvatāpramāṇāḥ hastināḥ, hastipramāṇā aśvāḥ / tato nānāvidhā\*khāṅga(khaḍga)muśalatomarapāśacakraśaraparaśvadhādiśastraviśeṣeṇa nānāvādītrasaṁkṣobheṇa ca mahābhayam upadarśayan mahatā \*balaudhena (balaughena) pāṇciko ‘nuprāptaḥ / hastyaśvarathanirghoṣān nānā-vādītraniḍhvanāt / yakṣāṇāṁ svaprabhāvāc ca prākārah prapapāta vai // tatas te karvaṭanivāsinaś tam balaugham dṛṣṭvā tac ca prākārapatanam param viśādam āpannāḥ papracchuḥ—kuta eṣa balaugha āgacchatīti? te kathayanti—śiḡhram dvārāṇi muñcata / eṣa prṣṭhataḥ kumāra āgacchati / tasya ca \*balaugho (balaughah) yaḍi ciram vidhārayiṣyatha, sarvathā na bhaviṣyatheti / te kathayanti—zyutpannā na vāyam rājā na kumārasya dhīmataḥ / nrpapauruṣakebhyo sma bhītāḥ samtrāsam āgatāḥ // tair dvārāṇi muktāni / tata ucchritadhvajapatākāpūrnakalāś nānāvidhatūryanirnāditaiḥ sudhanam kumāram pratyudgataḥ / tena ca samāśvāsītāḥ, tadabhiprāyaś ca rājabhataḥ sthāpitāḥ / nipakāś ca nigrhītāḥ / karapratyāyāś ca nibaddhāḥ / tatas tam karvaṭakam sphṭīkṛtya sudhanakumārāḥ pratinivṛttaḥ / (“[Vaiśravaṇa] saw Prince Sudhana, [who was, commanded by the king, marching with the troops to quell the rebels]. This occurred to him (Vaiśravaṇa), ‘Having set out for the purpose of fighting in battle, this [Sudhana], the bodhisattva in the Fortunate Aeon, will experience pain. Help must be given to him. The local chief (rebel) must be subjugated. And yet no living being must be pained.’ [Having] thus understood, he told Pāṇcika, the general of Yakṣas, ‘Come, you, O Pāṇcika, subjugate the local chief (rebel), [the enemy] of Prince Sudhana, without [fighting in] pitched battle! And yet no living being must be pained.’ [I shall do it] that way.’ Having answered [thus] to Vaiśravaṇa, the great king, Pāṇcika, the general of Yakṣas, created a fourfold army of divine beings: a man [who was] as tall as a *tāla* tree, elephants [that were] as big as mountains, and horses [that were] as big as elephants. Subsequently, representing a great threat by means of excellent weapons, such as various kinds of swords, maces, lances, nooses, disks, arrows, and axes, and by means of violent sounds from various instruments, Pāṇcika with [his] great army troops arrived [at the local chief’s castle]. Due to the rumbling sounds from the elephants, horses, and chariots; the violent sounds from the instruments; and the Yakṣas’ own splendor, the rampart [of the local chief’s castle] fell down. Then, having seen the army troops and the fall of the rampart, those dwelling in [this] local town became very frightened and asked, ‘Where does this mass of army troops come from?’ They said, ‘Open the gates immediately! This prince (Sudhana) and his army troops come after [us]. If [you do] not [open the gates] immediately, you will be broken up and will utterly cease to exist.’ They said, ‘We did not resist the king or the wise prince. We were afraid of the king’s men and intimidated.’ They opened the gates. After that, having raised banners and flags, and filled pots, and with various kinds of musical instruments sounding, [they] went out to meet Prince Sudhana. Then, he (Sudhana) comforted [them], and installed a king’s warrior for that purpose. [He] caught the key plotters and imposed taxes and tributes. After that, having made the local town prosperous, Prince Sudhana went back [to his place, Pañcāla].”) See also (Hiraoka 2007, pp. 223–24) for translation.*

ba) with them, give them gifts (*phan gdags pa*), and, as mentioned earlier, intimidate them using allied countries.<sup>40</sup>

The seventh measure entails the use of starvation tactics,<sup>41</sup> which is a form of economic sanction. In the *Asātarūpajātaka* (“Disagreeable State Jātaka”), the prince recaptured the kingdom of Bārāṇasī, which had been seized by the king of Kosala, by cutting off the kingdom’s supply of food and fuel for seven days. The prince’s mother advised him that ‘Pitched battle is not necessary. You should block the passages from all directions and surround the city of Bārāṇasī. Consequently, you will certainly acquire the people, [who] have suffered the loss of [fuel] woods, water, and food, and the city without pitched battle (i.e., If you cause the people to suffer the loss of fuel woods, water, and food by blocking the passages and besieging the city, you will certainly reclaim the city without pitched battle).’ The use of starvation tactics is thus distinguished from pitched battle, perhaps because the former do not involve the direct killing of opponents using weapons. However, the text appears to treat the use of starvation tactics as a less recommendable measure. Unlike in most of the *Jātakas* that are examined in this paper, the prince was not the Buddha in a former life. In the present life, the then-prince and his mother have suffered negative karmic retribution for their seven-day implementation of starvation tactics, which carries a much lighter soteriological sentence than rebirth in hell: the prince remained in his mother’s womb for seven years and then suffered a difficult birth for seven days, while the mother endured pregnancy for seven years and then suffered a difficult childbirth for seven days. During the seven-day starvation period, the king of Kosala was beheaded by the hungry people in Bārāṇasī, which was accidental on the part of the prince. The text does not explicitly mention any karmic retribution for the enemy king’s death, perhaps because the king’s death was not his intention.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> *Satyakapariṣvarta*, Tib. D 146, 109v6–110r3/ S 246, 80.4–81.1/ J 96.7–18: *smras pa / bram ze rgyal po’i chos de ltar yongs su rdzogs pa dang ldan pa’i chos kyi rgyal pos \*thab mo’i (thab mo D) g-yul zhig nye bar gnas na ji ltar nan tan du bya / smras pa / rgyal po chen po dus gsum du thabs la mkhas pa’i rnam pa gsum gyis nan tan du bgyi’o // de la dus gsum ni thog ma’i dus dang / bar gyi dus dang / tha ma’i dus so // de la thog ma’i dus kyi thabs mkhas pa ni / gal te rgyal po’am blon po mdza’ bar bgyi bas ‘grub par gda’ na / yang mdza’ bar bgyi bas nye bar bzung ste \*thab mo (thab mo D) de zhi bar bgyi’o // gal te phan gdags pa zhig gis ‘grub par gda’ na yang phan \*gdags pas (gdags pa J) nye bar bzung ste \*thab mo (thab mo D) de zhi bar bgyi’o // gal te phyogs mang po yongs su bzung ba dang de bas lthag pa’i dgrar ‘gyur ba’i ‘jigs pa la sogs pa bstan pas ‘grub par gda’ na yang / de gnyis bstan pas nye bar bzung ste \*thab mo (thab mo D) de zhi bar bgyi ste / de ltar dus dang po la thabs mkhas pa sbyar bar bgyi’o // gal te de dag mdza’ bar bgyi ba dang / phan gdags pa dang / ‘jigs pa bstan pa ... ([King Caṇḍapradīyā] said—O Brahmin! How should a dharma king, [who] has thus perfectly fulfilled the king’s dharma, act earnestly if [the enemy] army for battle is arrayed near [him]. [Satyaka] said—O Great king! [He] should cope [with it] earnestly by [using] three ways of skill in means at three times. In this regard, the three times [mean] the times [corresponding to] the first, midst, and last (viz., the first, second, and third steps). Of them, the skill in means at the time of the first [means this]: if a king or minister is able to achieve [avoiding a war] by forming a friendship [with the enemy], [he] should pacify [viz., avoid] the war by means of forming [that] friendship. If [he] is able to achieve [this] by giving gifts [or assistance], [he] should pacify the war by means of giving gifts. If [he] is able to achieve [this] by holding many directions [viz., alliance with many countries] and giving [the enemy negative senses,] such as a sense of fear of [his] becoming a greater opponent [through alliance], [he] should pacify the war by means of these two [viz., by means of intimidating the enemy with allied countries]. [He] should use the skill in means in this way at the time of the first. If ... these [three policies of] forming friendship [with the enemy], giving gifts [to the enemy], and intimidating [the enemy] ...”) See also (Sugiki 2020, pp. 13–14).*

<sup>41</sup> It seems that in reality, starvation tactics are not always peacefully executed, resulting in many of the people in the besieged place starving to death. However, in the Buddhist text that is examined here, only one man (the enemy king) died as a result of the use of such tactics, and his death was accidental rather than deliberately planned.

<sup>42</sup> *Asātarūpajātaka* (JA 100), P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), p. 409, l. 15–p. 410, l. 4: “yuddhena kammaṃ n’atthi, sabbadisāsu sañcāraṃ pacchinditvā bārāṇasinagaraṃ parivāretu, tato dārūḍakabhāttaparikkhayena kilantamanussaṃ nagaraṃ vinā va yuddhena gaṇhissatthi” paṇṇaṃ pesesi. so mātu sāsanaṃ sutvā sattadivāsāni sañcāraṃ pacchinditvā nagaraṃ rundhi. nagarā ālabhamānā sattame divase tassa rañño sīsaṃ gahetvā kumārassa adamsu. kumāro nagaraṃ pavisitvā rajjaṃ gahetvā pariyoṣāne yathākammaṃ gato. so etarahi satta divāsāni sañcāraṃ pacchinditvā nagaraṃ rundhitvā gahitakammanissandena sattavassāni lohitakumbhiyaṃ vasitvā sattahaṃ mūlhagabbhābhāvaṃ āpajji. ... supavāsāpi “nagaraṃ rundhitvā gaṇha tātā” ti pesitabhāvena sattavassāni kucchinā gabbhaṃ pariharitvā sattahaṃ mūlhagabbhā jāta. ((The king of Kosala took over Bārāṇasī. The prince of Bārāṇasī prepared for a war against the king of Kosala to recapture Bārāṇasī.) “[The prince’s mother] sent [the prince] a letter saying, ‘Pitched battle is not necessary. You should block the passages from all directions and surround the city of Bārāṇasī. Consequently, you will certainly acquire the people, [who] have suffered the loss of [fuel] woods, water, and food, and the city without pitched battle.’ Having heard [his] mother’s advice, for seven days, he blocked the passages and closed the city. On the seventh day, the city people, [who] did not get [any fuel woods and so on], beheaded that king [of Kosala] and presented [the king’s head] to the prince. The prince entered the city and [re]captured the kingdom. In the end, he passed away [and attained rebirth] in accordance with [his] karma. In [his] present [life], as a result of the karma [that he] acquired from having blocked the passages and having closed the city for seven days, he remained in a pot of blood (his mother’s womb)

The eighth measure, which can be found in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* (“Great Perfect-Nibbāna Sutta”), is resolution through the equitable distribution of profits. After the Buddha passed away and his physical body was cremated, eight groups of people insisted on taking the Buddha’s ashes for worship; as a result of these eight claims, tension arose between the claimant groups. Having reminded the claimants about Buddha’s teaching of forbearance (*khanti*) with the words, ‘It is not right indeed that [there] should be strife (*sampahāro*, which means *āvudhasampahāro* or ‘strife by weapons’ according to Buddhaghosa’s *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* commentary in the fifth century CE) in sharing out the best person’s ashes.,’ a Brahmin named Doṇa divided the Buddha’s ashes into eight equal portions and distributed them among the groups of people, which included warriors of different ethnicities. They agreed with this solution, and each group amiably received its portion of ashes.<sup>43</sup>

#### 4. Type 3: Fighting in a Pitched Battle without Killing

The other measures by which a warrior can refrain from killing are to fight in battle but avoid killing any of his opponents. This type can be further divided into two derived measures.

The first measure is to capture the enemy alive and force him to swear an oath: a warrior wins a battle by destroying the enemy’s military camp and capturing his opponents alive; he then induces them to swear an oath to no longer antagonize him, after which the warrior releases them.<sup>44</sup> The *Bhojājāṇīyajāṭaka* (“Swift Horse Jātaka”) tells a story about a military horse (another former life of the Buddha) that destroyed seven enemy kings’ military camps (*balakoṭṭhakaṃ bhinditvā*), captured the kings alive (*jīvagāhaṃ gahetvā*), and asked his king to spare them and send them back to their countries if they would take an oath (*sapathaṃ*) to no longer antagonize him.<sup>45</sup> Similarly, in the *Alīnacittajāṭaka* (“Alīnacitta Jātaka”), Prince Alīnacitta (another former life of the Buddha) won a war against the king of Kosala with the help of his military elephant, which destroyed the enemy king’s military camp, captured the king alive, admonished (*ovaditvā*) the captive king with the words, ‘From now on you must be careful; never think [the prince is just] a young boy!’ and released him. In this case,

---

for seven years and experienced a difficult birth for seven days. ... Suppavāsā (the prince’s mother in the present life) also [suffered this]: Because [she] advised, ‘O my son, block and take the city!’, she conceived a fetus in [her] womb for seven years and had a difficult childbirth for seven days.”) See also (Tanabe 1987, pp. 111–12) for translation.

<sup>43</sup> *Mahāparinibbānasutta* (DN 16), P ed., PTS, DN ii (Rhys Davids and Carpenter 1947), 6.25 (p. 165, l. 33–p. 166, l. 20, especially p. 166, l. 3–l. 10): ... *evaṃ vutte doṇo brāhmaṇo te saṃghe gaṇe etad avoca: suṇantu bhonto mama ekavākyam. amhākaṃ buddho ahu khantivādo. na hi sādhu yaṃ uttamaṃ puggalassa, sarirabhaṇṇiye siyā sampahāro. sabbe ‘va bhonto sahitā samaggā, sammodamānā karom’ atṭhabhāge.* (“... Having spoken thus, a brahmin [named] Doṇa said this to these assemblages and groups [of people]: ‘O sirs, listen to my speech! The Buddha taught us forbearance. It is not right indeed that [there] should be strife in sharing out the best person’s ashes. O sirs, [let] all [of us] be united together and harmonious, and let us be joyful and [divide the Buddha’s ashes] into eight portions.’”) See also (Nakamura 1980, p. 189) for translation.

*Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, P ed., PTS, (Stede 1931), p. 608, l. 22–l. 23: *siyā sampahāro ti āvudhasampahāro sādhu na siyā ti vuttaṃ hoti /* (“Strife should be—[it is] taught that strife by weapons be never good.”). See also (Nakamura 1980, p. 351).

<sup>44</sup> In the *Bhīmasenajāṭaka* (“Bhīmasena Jātaka”), Culladhanuggahapaṇḍita (the Buddha in his former life) went into battle, destroyed the enemy’s army camp, and captured the enemy king alive to attain fame as a warrior. Capturing one’s enemy alive is a war strategy that is recommended in several Buddhist scriptures. However, it is not in all cases explicitly taught in connection with the purpose of avoiding killing, although this application may be implied. *Bhīmasenajāṭaka* (JA 80), P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), p. 359, l. 16–l. 21: *“ajja mayā pākaṭṭhena bhavitum vaṭṭatīti” saṃgāmaṃ pavisitvā unnaditvā balakoṭṭhakaṃ bhinditvā sapattarājānaṃ jīvagāhaṃ gāhāpetvā bārāṇasirañño santikaṃ agamāsi. rājā tuṭṭho bodhisattassa mahantaṃ yaṣaṃ adāsi. tato paṭṭhāya culladhanuggahapaṇḍito ti sakalajambudīpe pākaṭṭhena ahoṣi.* (“Now, it is proper for me to become famous.” [Having thought] thus, he (Culladhanuggahapaṇḍita: another former life of the Buddha) went into battle, shouted, destroyed [the enemy’s] army camp, captured the enemy king alive, and went toward the king of Bārāṇasī. The king was satisfied and bestowed a great honor on the bodhisatta. Henceforth, the name Culladhanuggahapaṇḍita became well-known throughout the whole Jambu Continent.”) See also (Tanabe 1987, p. 52) for translation.

<sup>45</sup> *Bhojājāṇīyajāṭaka* (JA 23), P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), pp. 178–80, especially p. 180, l. 9–l. 15 and l. 20–l. 23: *assāroho bodhisattam utthapetvā ... tassa piṭṭhiyaṃ nisiditvā sattamaṃ balakoṭṭhakaṃ bhinditvā sattamaṃ rājānaṃ jīvagāhaṃ gahetvā rājabalassa niyyādesi. ... mahāsatto rājānaṃ āha: ‘mahārāja, satta rājāno mā ghātayittha, sapathaṃ karetvā vissajjetha, ... rājā ... satta rājāno puna attano \*adūbhāyasapathaṃ (adūbhāya sapathaṃ) karetvā sakaṭṭhānāni pesetvā ...* (“The rider made the bodhisatta (viz., the horse, the Buddha in his former life) rise, ... mounted up on its back, destroyed the seventh military camp, captured the seventh [enemy] king alive, and gave [the enemy king] over to [his] king’s army.... The great one (viz., the horse) said to the king, ‘O Great king, please do not let [your retainers] slay the seven kings; please make [them] swear an oath and let [them] go....’ ... having made [them] swear an oath not to try to harm himself again, the king sent the seven kings back to their respective homes, ...”) See also (Fujita 1984, pp. 202–4, especially p. 204) for translation. See also (Jenkins 2010, p. 67).



the admonishment is equivalent to inducing the enemy king swear an oath to no longer antagonize him.<sup>46</sup> Both in the *Bhojājānīyājātaka* and the *Alīnacittajātaka*, the measure of capturing one's enemy alive, inducing an oath, and setting him free is mentioned after the words, 'O Great king, please do not let [your retainers] slay the seven kings' and '[The elephant] stopped those who rose to kill him (the king of Kosala),' respectively. Hence, the measure is proposed as a viable alternative to killing. Although those who capture enemy kings alive in these narratives are military animals (a horse and an elephant) and not human warriors, this idea seems to be recommendable for human warriors as well.

In these texts, the enemy kings are captured alive; however, the texts do not mention whether the other enemy fighters, i.e., the enemy kings' retainer soldiers, are also captured alive. The *Satyakaparivarta* also teaches capturing alive (although the text does not mention the steps that should be taken before and after capturing one's enemy alive, i.e., destroying his military camp, inducing an oath, and setting him free, they can be considered to be implied.) Even though the text does not state which enemy warriors are captured alive, since its phrasing does not limit those who are captured alive to enemy kings, the implication seems to be that on the battlefield, a righteous king is required not only to capture the enemy king alive, but also to preserve the lives of his retainers.<sup>47</sup>

The second measure entails using weapons only to stop the enemy's attack and not to kill, that is, only for the purpose of protecting the true *dharma* (*dam pa'i chos*) or the Buddhist teachings. This is taught in the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* ("Great Perfect-Nirvāṇa Sūtra," c. fourth century CE). The text tells of an age of moral depravity, when monks are in danger of being attacked by corrupt monks and their evil devotees; monks are, therefore, allowed to be accompanied by lay devotees (*dge bsnyen*) who are armed, such as a king, when they travel. However, these armed companions are not allowed to kill their opponents; during their travels, they are permitted to use their weapons to stop attacks, but they must avoid killing their opponents. This is 'the precept of the excellently wise [lay devotees]' (*mchog tu mkhas pa'i tshul khirms*) in the age of moral depravity. After death, these lay devotees are reborn in Abhirati (*mngon par dga' ba*, "rejoicing in"), which is a paradise controlled by Akṣobhya Buddha, where they may attain enlightenment. A lay devotee is encouraged to arm himself and fight to protect monks because monks preserve the true *dharma* and because the devotee who protects the true *dharma* can reap great fruits, such as rebirth in Abhirati.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>46</sup> *Alīnacittajātaka* (JA 156), P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), p. 22, l. 10–l. 15: *hatthi nagarā nikkhamitvā koñcanādaṃ katvā mahājanaṃ santāsetvā palāpetvā balakoṭṭakaṃ bhinditvā kosalarājānaṃ cūlāya gahetvā ānetvā bodhisattassa pādāmūle nipajjāpetvā mūraṇatthāy' assa utthite vāretvā "ito paṭṭhāya appamatto hohi, kumāro daharo ti saññaṃ mā karīti" ovaditvā uyyojesi.* ("The elephant went out of the town, trumpeted, frightened and made the host of people run away, destroyed the [enemy's] military camp, seized the king of Kosala by his topknot, carried and laid [him] at the feet of the bodhisatta (Alīnacitta), stopped those who rose to kill him (the king of Kosala), admonished [the king of Kosala with the words:] 'From now on you must be careful; never think [the prince is just] a young boy!', and let [him] go.") The word 'jīvagāha' ("capturing alive") is used in (P ed.) p. 22, l. 23. See also (Tanabe 1987, p. 267) for translation. The text tells that Prince Alīnacitta was reborn in heaven after his death. However, it does not reveal where the military elephant, which fought as described above, was reborn. *Alīnacittajātaka* (JA 156), P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), p. 22, l. 19: *jīvitapariyosāne saggapadaṃ pūresi* ("After the end of [his] life, he (Alīnacitta) attained [rebirth in] the abode of heaven.")

<sup>47</sup> *Satyakaparivarta*, Tib. D 146, 110r3–r6/ S 246, 81.1–5/ J 96.18–97.6: *gal te de dag mdza' bar bgyi ba dang / phan gdags pa dang / 'jigs pa bstan pa \*gang gis (gang gi J) kyang bsgo ste ma btub na chos dang ldan pa'i rgyal pos sems gsum nye bar \*bzhaḡ (gzhaḡ D) ste \*thab mo (thab mo D) bgyi'o // gsum gang zhe na / ... dang por skye dgu yongs su bskyang ba la sems nye bar gzhaḡ par bgyi'o // gnyis pa ni phas kyi dgra las rgyal bar bgyi ba'i sems so // gsum pa ni srog gzung ba'i sems te / sems gsum po 'di dag nye bar \*bzhaḡ (gzhaḡ D) la / dpung gi tshogs yan lag \*bzhi pa (bzhi po J) la bka' stsal bar bgyi ste / de ltar dus bar ma la thabs mkhas pa sbyar bar bgyi'o // ("If [he] is not successful after having commanded [all of] these [three policies of] forming friendship, giving gifts, and intimidating, the righteous king can (or should) wage a war with three thoughts in mind. [King Caṇḍapradīyā asked–] 'What are [those] three?' ... [Satyaka said–] 'First, [he] should resolve to protect the people completely. The second is the [mental conviction] to defeat the enemy. The third is the [mental conviction] to capture [the enemy warriors] alive. With these three thoughts in mind, [he] should command [his] fourfold army. [He] should use the skill in means in this way at the intermediate time.") See also (Zimmermann 2000, pp. 201–2), (Jenkins 2010, p. 67), and (Sugiki 2020, p. 14).*

<sup>48</sup> *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, Tib. D 120, 47a7–49b2: *rigs kyi bu dam pa'i chos srung ba'i dge bsnyen gyis ni bslab pa'i gzhi lnga blang bar mi bya'o // dge bsnyen gyi' dul ba yang spyad par mi bya'o // tshul khirms dang cho ga dang yon tan dang ldan pa'i dge slong rnam bsrung ba'i phyr mda' gzhu dang ral gri dang mdung thung kha le ba lag tu thogs par bya'o // ... de nas de'i bstan pa lo bye ba phrag du ma'i bar du gnas gnas nas / gang gi tshe bstan pa gnas pa de'i lhaḡ ma lo bzhi bcu lus pa de'i chos nub tu cha ba'i dus na / dge slong sangs rgyas byin zhes bya ba g-yog 'khor mang po dang ldan pa seng ge'i sgra sgrogs pa gsung rab yan lag dgu'i chos ston pa zhig byung ste / de bran dang / bran mo dang / ba lang dang / ma he la sogs pa rdzas ngan pa 'chang ba / log pa'i chos ston pa / tshul khirms*

## 5. The Ideology Underlying the Buddhist Discourses

The Buddhist scriptures thus teach various measures by which a warrior can face problems in confrontation with armed opponents without killing them. In this paper's Introduction, I described the teachings that espouse moderate measures as "instructions from the standpoint that intentional killing must be avoided." However, it is necessary to ascertain whether they were really developed from such

'chal pa / sdang ba'i sems dang ldan pa rnam kyis thos nas / bsad pa'i sems bskyed de / tshul khrims 'chal pa'i phyogs rnam gcig tu bsdongs nas mtshon cha sna tshogs lag na thogs te / dge slong de'i thad du dong ngo // nga yang de'i tshe rgyal po srid sbyin zhes bya bar gyur te / rgyal po des gtam de thos nas dam pa'i chos bsrung ba'i phyir dge slong de'i thad du song ste de dag dang g-yul bgye'o // de nas chos smras pa de la de dag gis ma tshugs so // rgyal po de ni ral gri dang / mdung thung kha le ba dang / rdo rje rtse gcig pa dang / mda' rnam kyis lus la ma gtsags pa'i sa mtshams yungs 'bru tsam yang med par gyur to // de nas dge slong des rgyal po de de ltar gyur pa mthong nas legs so zhes smras te / dam pa'i chos bsrung bas ni de ltar bya dgos so // khyod ni chos dpag tu med pa'i skal pa can du 'gyur ro zhes byas so // de nas rgyal po des dge slong de'i tshig thos nas shi ba'i 'og tu de bzhin gshegs pa mi 'khrugs pa'i 'jig rten gyi kham su skyes so // der sems can gang rjes su yi rang bar gyur pa rnam dang / g-yul 'gyed 'gyed pa gang yin pa de dag thams cad kyis kyang byang chub thob par gyur to // de bzhin gshegs pa mi 'khrugs pa'i 'jig rten gyi kham mngon par dga' ba zhes bya ba'i 'jig rten gyi kham su de bzhin gshegs pa mi 'khrugs pa'i rnam pa zhes bya ba zhig kyang byung ngo // dge slong sangs rgyas byin yang rgyal po de shi ba'i rjes la shi nas de bzhin gshegs pa mi 'khrugs pa'i bstan pa la nyan thos kyi mchog tu gyur to // rgyal po de yang nyan thos gnyis par gyur to // de ltar na dam pa'i chos nub pa'i tshe dam pa'i chos bsrung bar bya'o // de'i tshe rgyal por gyur pa de ni nga yin no // dge slong de ni sangs rgyas 'od srung yin te / de ni yongs su mya ngan las 'das so // de ltar na dam pa'i chos bsrung ba'i 'bras bu ni dpag tu med de / 'bras bu rnam par dag pa des na nga yang rma bya mdongs ri mo can mang pos brgyan lta bur gyur te / mi shigs pa'i sku dang chos kyi sku mnyes par gyur to // ... // dge bsnyen dam pa'i chos bsrung ba'i 'bras bu ni rgya che'o // rigs kyi bu de bas na dge slong rnam mtshon cha lag na thogs pa'i dge bsnyen dag gis mdun du bdar ste rgyu bar bya'o // thegs pa chen po 'di la ni dge bsnyen gyis bsal pa'i gzhi lnga blang bar mi bya ste / dam pa'i chos bsrung ba'i phyir lag na mtshon cha thogs shing dge slong rnam bsrung bar bya'o // ... rigs kyi bu de bzhin gshegs pa yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa'i 'og tu nang 'khrug 'byung ba dang yul bcom pa dag 'byung bar 'gyur te / dus ngan par gyur pa de'i tshe mu ge'i nyes pas phal cher rab tu 'byung zhing mgo reg tu 'gyur te / de dag gis dge slong tshul khrims dang / cho ga dang / yon tan dang / spyod pa phun sum tshogs pa dang ldan pa dag skrod par 'gyur / gsod par 'gyur te / der dge slong tshul khrims dang ldan pa rnam kyis grong dang / grong khyer dang / ri khrod kyi grong dag tu ji ltar rgyu bar bya ste / de lta bu dag gi dus na dge slong tshul khrims dang ldan pa slob dpon du gyur ba rnam lam du 'gro ba na rang gi srog bsrung ba'i phyir mtshon cha lag na thogs pa dag der 'gro bar ngas gnaug ngo // dge bsnyen rnam dang / khyim bdag dang / rgyal po dang / blon po rnam kyis dge slong tshul khrims dang ldan pa bsrung ba'i phyir mtshon cha 'chang ba de yang tshul khrims yin zhes nga zer te / 'on kyang gsad par ni mi bya'o // dag pa'i phyir mtshon cha bcang bar bya ste / de ni mchog tu mkhas pa'i tshul khrims yin no // ("O son of the noble family! A lay devotee, who protects the true dharma should not receive the Five Precepts, nor should [he] practice the vinaya or rule of lay devotees. In order to protect monks who are perfect in precepts, manners of conduct, and merit, [a lay devotee] should hold an arrow and bow, a sword, and a short javelin (mdung thung kha le ba) in [his] hand.... Afterward, their doctrine continued to exist for many millions of years. Then, in the age when the rest of the duration of existence of that doctrine was forty years and the dharma was declining, a monk named Buddhadatta (sangs rgyas byin) appeared, who was accompanied by many attendants, who made a lion's roar, and who taught the nine limbs of the scriptures. [Corrupt monks (see below)]—who owned bad things [that monks were normally prohibited to own] such as male and female servants, cows, and buffalos; who taught a wrong dharma; whose morality was bad; and whose states of mind were hateful—heard of him (Buddhadatta) and thought of killing [him]. [People] with bad morality gathered together, held various weapons in [their] hands, and went to the place of that monk (Buddhadatta). At that time I (the Buddha) was a king named Bhavadatta (srid sbyin). Having heard that news, that king (Bhavadatta) [also] went to the place of that monk (Buddhadatta) and fought with them (evil people) in order to protect the true dharma. Owing to that, they (evil people) could not [kill] that preacher (Buddhadatta). On the body of that king (Bhavadatta), there was not even a point the size of a mustard seed that was not pierced with a sword, a short javelin, a single-pronged vajra (rdo rje rtse gcig pa), or an arrow. Then, having seen that king becoming in this way, and having uttered 'Sādhu (well done),' that monk (Buddhadatta) said, '[Anyone who] protects the true dharma should act in that manner. You will be blessed with innumerable dharmas.' Then, having heard the words of that monk, that king died, and after [death] he was born in the world of Akṣobhya Tathāgata. In that place, all sentient beings who had rejoiced and those who had fought in battle [to protect the true dharma] attained enlightenment. In the world of Akṣobhya Tathāgata, [which is] the world named Abhirati (mngon par dga' ba, 'rejoicing in'), a tathāgata named Akṣobhyākāra (mi 'khrugs pa'i rnam pa) also appeared. The monk Buddhadatta also died after that king's (Bhavadatta) death and became the best hearer (pupil) of Akṣobhya Tathāgata's teaching. That king (Bhavadatta) became the second best hearer (pupil). Therefore, when the true dharma is declining, one should protect the true dharma. He who was the king (Bhavadatta) at that time is me (the Buddha). That monk (Buddhadatta) is Kāśyapa Buddha. He had been completely liberated from the cycle of death and rebirth (yongs su mya ngan las 'das, 'complete nirvāṇa'). The effect of protecting the true dharma is thus limitless. Thanks to the pure effect of that, I also became like a peacock, having multicolored patterns [on its feathers], and I rejoice in [having] the indestructible body and the Dharma Body. ... The [reward] that a lay devotee [derives from] protecting the true dharma is enormous. O son of the noble family! Therefore, monks should travel placing in front (being accompanied by) lay devotees who hold weapons in [their] hands. In this Great Vehicle (Mahāyāna), a lay devotee should not receive the Five Precepts: holding weapons in hand, [a lay devotee] should protect monks in order to protect the true dharma. ... O son of the noble family! After the Tathāgata has been completely liberated from the cycle of death and rebirth, an internal war will break out, the country will be destroyed. In that bad age, due to the ravages of famine, most [of the people] will become monks and have [their] heads shaved. They will drive out or kill monks who are perfect in precepts, manners of conduct, merit, and practice. Therefore, in such an age when monks who observe precepts must travel to a village, a town, and a mountain village, when monks who observe precepts and are teachers (slob dpon) travel, [lay devotees who] hold weapons in hand go with them (der 'gro, literally 'go to that [monks' place]') in order to protect [the monks'] own lives: [this is] permitted by me. Lay devotees, householders, kings, and officials hold weapons to protect monks who

standpoint. Did the compilers of the instructions really intend to develop measures that do not involve killing? Is there not a possibility that the instructions avoid mentioning killing because such mentions were omitted in the transmission of the texts or because they are implied, thus rendering the explicit mention of killing unnecessary from the compilers' perspective?

It seems most likely that the measures were deliberately developed to prohibit killing in battle. As Sections 3 and 4 of this paper clarify, many of the discourses explicitly state that the protagonist warriors implemented the measures because of their wish to avoid killing in battle<sup>49</sup>, or the texts teach the measures in connection with the precept against killing. Comparison with Indian Classics supports that analysis.

Some of the Indian Classics that include discourses on warfare, such as the *Mahābhārata* (*Śāntiparvan*), the *Manusmṛti*, and the *Arthaśāstra*, teach measures that bear similarity to the Type 2 and 3 measures in the Buddhist scriptures, as discussed in Sections 3 and 4.<sup>50</sup> However, there are also differences, among which the most important, from the perspective espoused in Section 5, concern differences regarding a warrior's motivation for adhering to a certain measure. I will discuss the differences regarding the reason for or purpose of adherence to a particular measure, using the *Arthaśāstra* specifically because it includes more discourses on similar measures than the *Mahābhārata* (*Śāntiparvan*) and the *Manusmṛti*.<sup>51</sup>

In the *Arthaśāstra*, an interlocutor named Bhāradvāja teaches that a weaker king who is attacked by a stronger king and his army should wholly surrender.<sup>52</sup> This measure is similar to the Buddhist

---

observe precepts: this is also a precept. I declare so. However, one must not kill. One should hold a weapon for stopping [the enemy's attack]. This is the precept of the excellently wise.") See (Shimoda 1993, pp. 247–50) for translation. See also (Shimoda 1991, pp. 12–33) and (Schmithausen 1999, pp. 57–58). The instruction "One must not kill" in the final part is not included in Faxian's Chinese translation of the same scripture (Shimoda 1991, pp. 28–29).

<sup>49</sup> Such a warrior's wish is not explicitly mentioned in the *Kūṭadantasutta*, *Aśokāvadāna*, *Palāyijātaka*, *Maṇikuṇḍalajātaka*, *Ghatajātaka*, and *Dutiyapalāyijātaka* (Section 3 in this paper). However, the kings in the first two texts (Mahāvijita and Aśoka, respectively) are described as good and exemplary kings, and all of the protagonist warriors in the other texts were the Buddha in former lives. Therefore, it seems plausible to speculate that they also desired to avoid killing in battle.

<sup>50</sup> Jenkins (2010, p. 67) points out that the Indian Classics and the Buddhist scriptures include similar teachings about how to deal with warriors who do not aspire to fight: "The *Arthaśāstra*, *Manusmṛti*, *Dharmasūtras*, and *Śāntiparvan* in the *Mahābhārata* all agree that non-combatants, or those surrendering, fallen, disarmed, fleeing, or petrified by fear, shall not be harmed." I do not discuss this aspect (i.e., how to deal with opponents who have abandoned fighting) because the purpose of this paper is to investigate methods for inducing armed opponents to abandon fighting.

<sup>51</sup> I note below the other major differences, found in similar ways, that I have not argued in the main text because they do not concern the reason or purpose. All is impermanent by nature; therefore, a king should not grieve the loss of his wealth for diplomatic reasons; this is taught both in the Buddhist scriptures (particularly in the *Maṇikuṇḍalajātaka*, Type 2) and in the *Arthaśāstra* (Skt.ed. (Kangle 1969), 12.1.32: see also (Kamimura 1984, p. 253) and (Olivelle 2013, p. 394) for translation). However, the effects are different. In the *Maṇikuṇḍalajātaka*, the enemy king was so struck by that teaching that he returned the stolen wealth. However, in the *Arthaśāstra*, the principle is taught as a strategy, wherein a weaker king gives his wealth to the stronger enemy to settle the conflict with that enemy, and the wealth, once relinquished, is never returned to the weaker king. As Zimmermann (2000, pp. 200–1) pointed out, the fourfold diplomatic policy of forming friendship, giving gifts, intimidation, (and the use of armed forces or warfare as a last resort, which is not a topic of discussion in this paper) in the Buddhist *Satyakapariṇvarta* (Type 2) is derived from the idea of the fourfold diplomatic policy of conciliation (*sāman*), gift (*dāna*), separation (*bheda*), and armed forces (*daṇḍa*) as a last resort, as found in the Brahmanical *Dharma* scriptures. The same fourfold policy is taught several times in the *Arthaśāstra* (for example, Skt. ed. (Kangle 1969), 7.16.2–4: see also (Kamimura 1984, p. 127) and (Olivelle 2013, pp. 320–1) for translation). Separation (dividing the enemies' union), the third policy in the *Dharma* scriptures and the *Arthaśāstra*, is replaced by intimidation in the Buddhist text. This is perhaps partially because, as Jenkins (2010, p. 67) said, intimidation is a relatively popular measure in Buddhist texts, such as in the narrative of the destruction of the Śākyas (Type 2). The *Arthaśāstra* mentions intimidation independently of the fourfold diplomatic policy (Skt. ed. (Kangle 1969), 10.4.1–16, 13.1.1, etc.: see also (Kamimura 1984, pp. 229–30 and p. 273) and (Olivelle 2013, pp. 381–2 and p. 405) for translation). Sending a messenger to allied countries to attack (not intimidate) the enemy is mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra*, 12.3.18–21 (see also (Kamimura 1984, pp. 259–60) and (Olivelle 2013, pp. 398–9) for translation). Starvation tactics can also be found both in the Buddhist *Asātarūpajātaka* (Type 2) and in the *Arthaśāstra* (Skt. ed. (Kangle 1969), 7.15.9: see also (Kamimura 1984, p. 123) and (Olivelle 2013, p. 318) for translation). However, the *Arthaśāstra* mentions it from a different viewpoint: a weaker king should find a fortress where the stronger enemy cannot cut off his supply of food and other necessities.

<sup>52</sup> *Arthaśāstra*, Skt.ed. (Kangle 1969), 12.1.1–2: "balīyasābhiyukto durbalaḥ sarvatrānupraṇāto vetasadharmā tiṣṭhet / indrasya hi sa praṇāmatī yo balīyaso namati" iti bhāradvājah / ("A weak [king], who has been attacked by a stronger [enemy], should be entirely obedient to (literally, should everywhere bow to) [the enemy], [following] the law of a reed because he who bows to the stronger one bows to Indra," Bhāradvāja [said] thus.") See also (Kamimura 1984, p. 250) and (Olivelle 2013, p. 393) for translation.

measure of surrendering to the enemy without resistance (see Section 3). However, in the Buddhist texts, such as the *Seyyajātaka*, a king surrenders because he does not wish to kill in battle and not because the enemy is stronger.

The *Arthaśāstra* teaches that a weaker king whose castle is captured by his enemy king should hide until an opportunity arises to sneak into the enemy king's castle (bedroom) under cover of night and assassinate him.<sup>53</sup> This is in some ways similar to the story of King Sīlava in the Buddhist *Mahāsīlavajātaka* (Section 3); however, Sīlava did not assassinate the enemy king in his bedroom. Instead, the enemy king was struck by Sīlava's virtue, which is what enabled the latter to miraculously sneak into the former's bedroom, prompting the former to return Sīlava's kingdom.

Capturing the enemy alive is also a common measure that is taught in both Buddhist texts, such as the *Bhojājānīyajātaka* (Section 4), and the *Arthaśāstra*. However, in the Buddhist texts, a warrior captures his enemy alive to avoid killing him, while in the *Arthaśāstra*, it is done to force the captured king to trade his kingdom for his freedom.<sup>54</sup>

The inducement of an oath is considered to be an effective means to end conflict, both in the Buddhist texts, such as the *Bhojājānīyajātaka* (Section 4), and in the *Arthaśāstra*. In the Buddhist texts, the enemy is coerced into swearing an oath after he is captured alive; however, in the *Arthaśāstra*, an oath (*śapatha*) is made when the means of "promise" (or being truthful, *satya*), which means to promise peace-making, may be broken. In the *Arthaśāstra*, a king or warrior makes an oath with his hand touching fire, water, or another element/thing that could take his life, for instance, in the form of a fire disaster, and so on, if he breaks the oath.<sup>55</sup> However, the Buddhist texts do not explicitly explain whether an enemy who has made an oath may be deprived of his life if he were to break the oath.

Evidently, the *Arthaśāstra* and the Buddhist texts have several ideas in common, although they differ with regard to some details. The differences can be summarized as follows. In the *Arthaśāstra*, the measures are politically more pragmatic. They are not explicitly connected to a warrior's religious desire to refrain from killing, and some of the measures involve or result in the killing of opponents. However, in the Buddhist scriptures, none of the measures involve or result in killing. On that premise,

<sup>53</sup> *Arthaśāstra*, Skt.ed. (Kangle 1969), 12.5.43–44: *evam gṛhitadurgo vā prāśyaprāśaṃ caityam upasthāpya daivatapratimāc chidraṃ praviśyāsīta, gūḍhabhittiṃ vā, daivatapratimāyuktam vā bhūmigrham // viśmrte suruṅgayā rātrau rājāvāsam anupraviśya sūptam amitraṃ hanyāt* // ("Alternatively [the weak king whose] fortress has been thus captured [by the enemy] should place eatable foods near a place of worship (*caitya*), enter the space between images of deities, and stay [there]. Alternatively, [he should hide behind] a secret wall or [in] an underground chamber linked with the image of deity. When least expected, through the underground passage, at night, he should sneak into the royal residence and kill the sleeping enemy [king].") See also (Kamimura 1984, p. 268) and (Olivelle 2013, p. 404) for translation.

<sup>54</sup> In the *Arthaśāstra*, its Sanskrit is *jīvagrāha*. *Arthaśāstra*, Skt.ed. (Kangle 1969), 13.3.30 and 4.31: ... *jīvagrāheṇa vā rājyavinimayam kārayet* // ("[Having made the enemy king come out, ...] Alternatively, by capturing [the enemy king] alive, he should exchange [him for his] kingdom.") See also (Kamimura 1984, p. 284 and p. 291) and (Olivelle 2013, p. 412 and p. 416) for translation.

<sup>55</sup> In the *Arthaśāstra*, "oath" is one of the four means for making peace (viz., promise, oath, surety (*pratibhū*), and hostage (*pratigraha*)). *Arthaśāstra*, Skt.ed. (Kangle 1969), 7.17.3–14: "*satyaṃ śapatho vā calaḥ saṃdhiḥ, pratibhūḥ pratigraho vā sthāvaraḥ*" *ity ācāryaḥ / neti kauṭilyaḥ / satyaṃ śapatho vā paratreha ca sthāvaraḥ saṃdhiḥ, iha artha eva pratibhūḥ pratigraho vā balāpekṣaḥ / "saṃhitāḥ smah"* *iti satyasamdhāḥ pūrve rājānaḥ satyena saṃdadhire / tasyātikrame śapathena agnyudakasitāprākāraḥ śaṣṭastiskandhāśvapṛṣṭarathopasthaśastraratnabīja-gandharasasuvāṇahiranyāny ālebhire* "*hanyur etāni tyajeyuḥ cainaṃ yaḥ śapatham atikrāmet*" *iti / śapathātikrame mahatām tapasvinām mukhyānām vā pratibhūvyabandhaḥ pratibhūḥ / tasmin yaḥ parāvagrahasamarthān pratibhūvo gṛhṇāti, so 'tisamdhatte / viparīto 'tisamdhīyate // bandhumukhyapragrahaḥ pratigrahaḥ / tasmin yo dūṣyāmātyam dūṣyāpatyam vā dadāti, so 'tisamdhatte / viparīto 'tisamdhīyate pratigrahaḥ gṛahanaḥ viśvāstasya hi parāś chidreṣu nirapekṣaḥ praharati* / ("Masters [said], 'Peace [made by] promise or oath is unstable. [By] surety or hostage, [it is] stable.' Kauṭilya [answered], 'No. Peace [made by] promise or oath is stable both here and hereafter. Dependent on power, the surety or hostage is only useful here. With [the words] 'We have made peace' the ancient kings, [who] kept [their] promise, made peace with a promise. When that [promise might] be broken, they touched a fire, water, furrow, wall, clod, elephant's shoulder, horse's back, chariot's seat, weapon, jewel, seed, perfume, juice, or gold coin, [with an oath that] 'These [things] should kill and abandon the one who breaks [his] oath.' When the oath [might] be broken, [they entered into] a binding [agreement] with a bondsperson from [among] great men, ascetics, or chiefs; [this is] the surety. In this regard, he who has a bondsperson capable of stopping the enemy overreaches [the enemy]. In the reverse case, he is overreached. Taking a relative or a chief is [what it means to take a] hostage. In this regard, he who gives a bad minister or a bad child [to the enemy as a hostage] overreaches [the enemy]. In the reverse case, he is overreached because [by being] indifferent to [the hostage], the enemy hits on a weak point within [him, who is] trusting [that the enemy] has received [a true] hostage.") See also (Kamimura 1984, pp. 131–32) and (Olivelle 2013, pp. 323–24) for translation.



I propose the following hypothesis to explain the similarities and differences between the *Arthaśāstra* and the Buddhist texts: the compilers of the Buddhist texts and the *Arthaśāstra* collected ideas about the various means by which warriors could settle conflicts with their opponents from common oral and textual sources. (The Buddhist compilers may have borrowed some ideas from the *Arthaśāstra* and vice versa.) The texts therefore reflect similar ideas. However, whether the ideas were ultimately developed into measures involving killing depended on the compilers.

Based on all the material that has been discussed above, it seems most likely that from among the various pan-Indic ideas about settling conflict, the compilers of the Buddhist discourses selected certain measures and reshaped them from the perspective of the Buddhist precept against killing. Hence, I maintain that they are “instructions from the standpoint that intentional killing must be avoided.”

## 6. Conclusions

Buddhist scriptures in ancient South Asia include discourses on moderate measures by which a warrior can face conflicts with armed opponents without resorting to killing them in battle. These measures can be divided into three types, which are summarized as follows.

Type 1 is to renounce the role of warrior. Type 2 is to solve problems with armed opponents without resorting to pitched battle. The measures that fall into this type are (2-1) surrendering without resistance or fleeing; (2-2) being virtuous (i.e., possessing a well-trained fourfold army, having such merit that gods and demons are inclined to help, having gorgeous royal architecture, observing the precepts, and harnessing the supernatural power of meditation); (2-3) preaching to the enemy; (2-4) intimidating the enemy with words, weapons, an enormous army (i.e., one that makes frightening sounds, is splendid in appearance, and wields destructive power), and alliances with other countries; (2-5) forming a friendship with the enemy; (2-6) giving the enemy a gift; (2-7) using starvation tactics, which perhaps constitute a less recommendable measure because such tactics cause people to suffer hunger; and (2-8) evenly distributing profits. Type 3 is to refrain from killing one's opponents while fighting a pitched battle. This type includes (3-1) capturing the enemy alive, forcing him to swear an oath, and then releasing him; and (3-2) using weapons only to stop the enemy's attack rather than killing him in the context of battles to protect monks who know and teach the true *dharma*. None of the texts that teach these measures state that a warrior has been or will be reborn in hell as karmic retribution for his implementation of any of the measures. Only the discourse in the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, which teaches measure (3-2), explicitly states that a fighter attains rebirth in heaven (Abhirati) because of his adherence to the measure.

The fundamental ideology or code of ethics that underlies the abovementioned types of measures is the precept against killing. From this perspective, the Type 1 measure is presented as leading to a warrior's permanent release from his duty to fight in war. Meanwhile, the measures that can be classified as Types 2 and 3 acknowledge the warrior's role in settling problems with opponents insofar as he does not intentionally kill his opponents. Similar ideas regarding measures for facing military confrontation can be found in some of the Indian Classics that teach statecraft, such as the *Arthaśāstra*. It seems that Buddhist compilers collected certain ideas about such measures from common oral and textual sources, reshaped the ideas, and developed the measures in accordance with the Buddhist precept against killing. As a result, kings and other warriors who implement these measures do not attract the bad karmic retribution that intentional killing normally produces. However, at the same time, their implementation of these measures (except for measure (3-2) according to the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*) is not sufficient if they wish to accrue enough good karmic potential to attain rebirth in heaven. Constant effort is required to earn a happy state of existence after death. As I said in (2020), in premodern warrior societies, religions often provided the institutional basis for both a code of ethics and a soteriology for warriors, for whom fighting was a duty dictated by their social

role.<sup>56</sup> Thus, Buddhist compilers' development of ethically and soteriologically significant discourses on those measures represents an aspect of Buddhism's function as a religion in ancient South Asia.

**Funding:** This research was funded by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (20K00054), Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

**Acknowledgments:** I appreciate the helpful advice and suggestions of the three peer reviewers.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## Abbreviations

D/Tib. D	Sde dge recension of the Tibetan Buddhist canon
DN	<i>Dīghanikāya</i>
J	(Jampal 2010)
JA	Pāli <i>Jātaka</i>
P ed.	Pāli text critically edited
PTS	Pāli Text Society
S/Tib. S	Stog Palace recension of the Tibetan Buddhist canon
Skt ed.	Sanskrit text critically edited
SN	<i>Samyuttanikāya</i>
T	Taishō recension of the Chinese Buddhist canon
Tib ed.	Tibetan text critically edited
Vin	<i>Vinayaṭṭaka</i>

## Primary sources:

- Arthapadasūtra* (義足經 or *Yizujing*). T 198.
- Arthasāstra*. Skt ed., (Kangle 1969).
- Alīnacittajātaka* (JA 156). P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), pp. 17–23.
- Aśokāvādāna*. Skt ed., (Mukhopadhyaya 1963).
- Asadisajātaka* (JA 181). P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), pp. 86–92.
- Asātarūpajātaka* (JA 100). P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), pp. 407–410.
- Kāmajātaka* (JA 467). P ed., PTS, JA iv (Fausboll 1887), pp. 167–175.
- Kumbhakārājātaka* (JA 408). P ed., PTS, JA iii (Fausboll 1883), pp. 375–383.
- Kūṭadantasutta* (DN 5). P ed., PTS, DN i (Rhys Davids and Carpenter 1890), pp. 127–149.
- Gandhārājātaka* (JA 406). P ed., PTS, JA iii (Fausboll 1883), pp. 363–369.
- Ghatajātaka* (JA 355). P ed., PTS, JA iii (Fausboll 1883), pp. 168–170.
- Jātakamālā*. Skt ed., (Vaidya 1959a).
- Dutiyapālāyijātaka* (JA 230). P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), pp. 219–221.
- Palāyijātaka* (JA 229). P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), pp. 216–218.
- Bhīmasenajātaka* (JA 80). P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), pp. 355–359.
- Bhojājānīyajātaka* (JA 23). P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), pp. 178–180.
- Makhādevajātaka* (JA 9). P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), pp. 137–139.
- Maṇikundalajātaka* (JA 351). P ed., PTS, JA iii (Fausboll 1883), pp. 153–155.
- Mahāparinibbānasutta* (DN 16). P ed., PTS, DN ii (Rhys Davids and Carpenter 1947), pp. 72–168.
- Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* ('Phags pa yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa chen po thegs pa chen po'i mdo). Tib. D 120.
- Mahāvamsa*. P ed., (Geiger 1908).
- Mahāsilavajātaka* (JA 51). P ed., PTS, JA i (Fausboll 1877), pp. 261–268.
- Vinayaṭṭaka* (Khandaka, *Mahāvagga*). P ed., PTS Vin i (Oldenberg 1879).
- Satyakaparivarta* ('Phags pa byang chub sems dpa'i spyod yul gyi thabs kyi yul la rnam par 'phrul ba bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo). Tib. D 146 and S 246 (or vol. 77, I) and Tib ed., (Jampal 2010).
- Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* of Buddhaghosa, P ed., PTS, (Stede 1931).
- Seyyajātaka* (JA 282), P ed., PTS, JA ii (Fausboll 1879), pp. 400–403.
- Sudhanakumārāvadāna* (*Divyāvadāna* 30), Skt ed. (Vaidya 1959b), pp. 283–300.

<sup>56</sup> (Sugiki 2020, particularly abstract and pp. 1–3).

## References

- Bapat, P. V. 1951. *The Arthapada Sutra, Spoken by the Buddha—Translated by the Upāsaka Che-Kien under the Wu Dynasty (222–280 A. D.), Parts I & II*. Calcutta: Visva-Bharati Publishing Department.
- Collins, Steven. 1998. *Nirvana and Other Buddhist Felicities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fausboll, V. 1877. *The Jātaka Together with Its Commentary Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*, vol. I. London: Trübner & Co.
- Fausboll, V. 1879. *The Jātaka Together with Its Commentary Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*, vol. II. London: Luzac & Company Ltd.
- Fausboll, V. 1883. *The Jātaka Together with Its Commentary Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*, vol. III. London: Trübner & Co.
- Fausboll, V. 1887. *The Jātaka Together with Its Commentary Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*, vol. IV. London: Luzac & Company Ltd.
- Fronsdal, Gil. 2006. *The Dhammapada, A New Translation of the Buddhist Classic with Annotations*. Boston and London: Shambhala.
- Fujita, Kōtatsu. 1984. *Jātaka Zenshyū*, vol. 1. Edited by Hajime Nakamura. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Geiger, Wilhelm. 1908. *The Mahāvamsa*. London: Published for the Pali Text Society by Oxford University Press.
- Geiger, Wilhelm, and Mabel Haynes Bode. 1912. *The Mahavamsa or, The Great Chronicle of Ceylon*. (Translation series; no. 3); London: Pali Text Society.
- Hiraoka, Satoshi. 2002. *Setsuwa no Kōkōgaku, Indo Bukkyō Setsuwa ni Himerareta Shisō*. Kyoto: Daizō Shuppan.
- Hiraoka, Satoshi. 2007. *Buddha ga Nazotoku Sanze no Monogatari, Divya Avadāna Zen'yaku*, vol. 2. Kyoto: Daizō Shuppan.
- Jamspal, Lozang. 2010. *The Range of the Bodhisattva, A Mahāyāna Sūtra (Byang chub sems dpa'i spyod yul) The Teaching of the Nirgrantha Satyaka, Critical Tibetan Edition*. New York: The American Institute of Buddhist Studies, Columbia University Center for Buddhist Studies, and Tibet House US.
- Jenkins, Stephen. 2010. Making Merit through Warfare and Torture According to the *Ārya-Bodhisattva-gocara-upāyaṇīyaya-vikurvaṇa-nirdeśa Sūtra*. In *Buddhist Warfare*. Edited by Michael K. Jerryson and Mark Juergensmeyer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 59–75.
- Kaji, and Kan'yaku Kenkyūkai. 2019. *Gisokukyō kenkyū no Shiza, Hu Kundoku*; Kyoto: Jishōsha.
- Kamimura, Katsuhiko. 1984. *Kauṭilya Jitsuri Ron, Kodai Indo no Teiō Gaku*, vol. 2. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Kane, P. V. 1993. *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Medieval Religious and Civil Law)*, vol. 3. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. First published 1946.
- Kangle, R. P. 1969. *The Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra. Part I, A Critical Edition with a Glossary*. Bombay: Bombay University. First published 1960.
- Keown, Damien. 2014. The Role of Deterrence in Buddhist Peace-building. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 21: 656–78.
- Maeda, Sengaku. 1982. *Jātaka Zenshyū*, vol. 3. Edited by Hajime Nakamura. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Matsumura, Hisashi, and Shin'ya Matsuda. 1988. *Jātaka Zenshyū*, vol. 4. Edited by Hajime Nakamura. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Mizuno, Kōgen. 1952. Arthapada Sūtra (Gisokukyō) nitsuite (On the Arthapada Sutra). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies)* 1: 87–95. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Mukhopadhyaya, Sujitkumar. 1963. *The Aśokāvadāna: Sanskrit Text Compared with Chinese Versions*; Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Murakami, Shinkan. 1996. Shoki no Bukkyō niokeru HuseSSHō to Wahei no Shikō (The Principles of Non-killing and Peace in Early Buddhism). *Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai Nenpō (Journal of the Nippon Buddhist Research Association)* 61: 15–33.
- Nakamura, Hajime. 1980. *Buddha Saigo no Tabi, Dai Parinibbānasutta*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1879. *The Vinaya Piṭakam: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language Vol. I The Mahāvagga*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2013. *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India, Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rhys Davids, T. W., and J. Estlin Carpenter. 1947. *The Dīgha Nikāya*, vol. II. London: Pali Text Society by Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press. First published 1903.

- Rhys Davids, T. W., and J. Estlin Carpenter. 1890. *The Dīgha Nikāya, vol. I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Pāli Text Society).
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1999. Aspects of the Buddhist Attitude towards War. In *Violence Denied: Violence, Non-violence and the Rationalization of Violence in South Asian Cultural History*. Edited by E. M. Houben and K. R. Van Kooij. Leiden: Brill, pp. 45–67.
- Shimoda, Masahiro. 1991. “Genshi Nehankyō” no Sonzai: “Daijō Nehankyō” no Seiritsushi teki Kenkyū, Sono 1 (The Urtext of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra). *Tōyōbunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō (The Memoirs of the Institute for Oriental Culture)* 113: 1–126.
- Shimoda, Masahiro. 1993. *Zōbun Wayaku Daihatsunehankyō (An Annotated Japanese Translation of the Tibetan Version of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra), vol. 1*. Tokyo: The Sankibo Press.
- Stede, W. 1931. *Sumaṅgalavilāsini, Buddhaghosa’s Commentary of the Dīgha-Nikāya, Part II*. London: Luzac & Company Ltd.
- Strong, John S. 1983. *The Legend of King Aśoka: A Study and Translation of the Aśokāvadāna*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sugiki, Tsunehiko. 2020. Compassion, Self-Sacrifice, and Karma in Warfare: Buddhist Discourse on Warfare as an Ethical and Soteriological Instruction for Warriors. *Religions* 11: 66. [CrossRef]
- Tanabe, Kazuko. 1987. *Jātaka Zenshyū, vol. 2*. Edited by Hajime Nakamura. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Vaidya, Paraśurāma Lakshmaṇa. 1959a. *Jātakamālā Āryaśūraviracitā (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 21)*. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Vaidya, Paraśurāma Lakshmaṇa. 1959b. *Divyāvadāna*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Walshe, Maurice. 1987. *The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Dīgha Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Yao, Fumi. 2013. *Konponsetsuissaiubu Ritsu Yakuji*. Tokyo: Rengō Shuppan.
- Zimmermann, Michael. 2000. *A Mahāyānist Criticism of Arthaśāstra: The Chapter on Royal Ethics in the Bodhisattva-gocaropāya-viśaya-vikurvaṇa-nirdeśa-sūtra*. Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyō Gaku Kōtō Kenkyū Jo Nenpō. Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 1999. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, pp. 177–211.
- Zimmermann, Michael. 2006. Only a Fool Becomes a King: Buddhist Stances on Punishment. In *Buddhism and Violence*. Edited by Michael Zimmermann. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, pp. 213–42.

**Publisher’s Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



© 2020 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).