

Silla Monks' Interpretations of the Precept Against Taking of Life

저자 (Authors)	LEE Jarang
출처 (Source)	International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture 31(1) , 2021.6, 115-140 (26 pages)
발행처 (Publisher)	동국대학교 불교학술원 Academy of Buddhist Studies, Dongguk University
URL	http://www.dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE10579461
APA Style	LEE Jarang (2021). Silla Monks' Interpretations of the Precept Against Taking of Life. <i>International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture</i> , 31(1), 115-140.
이용정보 (Accessed)	삼성현역사문화관 183.106.106.*** 2021/10/19 13:31 (KST)

저작권 안내

DBpia에서 제공되는 모든 저작물의 저작권은 원저작자에게 있으며, 누리미디어는 각 저작물의 내용을 보증하거나 책임을 지지 않습니다. 그리고 DBpia에서 제공되는 저작물은 DBpia와 구독계약을 체결한 기관소속 이용자 혹은 해당 저작물의 개별 구매자가 비영리적으로만 이용할 수 있습니다. 그러므로 이에 위반하여 DBpia에서 제공되는 저작물을 복제, 전송 등의 방법으로 무단 이용하는 경우 관련 법령에 따라 민, 형사상의 책임을 질 수 있습니다.

Copyright Information

Copyright of all literary works provided by DBpia belongs to the copyright holder(s) and Nurimedia does not guarantee contents of the literary work or assume responsibility for the same. In addition, the literary works provided by DBpia may only be used by the users affiliated to the institutions which executed a subscription agreement with DBpia or the individual purchasers of the literary work(s) for non-commercial purposes. Therefore, any person who illegally uses the literary works provided by DBpia by means of reproduction or transmission shall assume civil and criminal responsibility according to applicable laws and regulations.

Silla Monks' Interpretations of the Precept Against Taking of Life

LEE Jarang

LEE Jarang is an assistant professor of the Humanities Korea Project at the Academy of Buddhist Studies at Dongguk University in Seoul, Korea. She received her PhD from the Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology at the University of Tokyo with a dissertation titled "A Study on the Early Buddhist Order: The Division of Buddhist Order and the Founding of Buddhist Sects." Her primary academic interest is the *Vinaya* tradition and the Sino-Korean Buddhist precepts tradition. Some of her publications include "Two *Nānāsaṃvāsakabbūmi* in the *Kosambakkhandhaka*" (2000), "Ownership and Distribution in Early Buddhist Monasticism" (2012), "The Significance of the *Four-part Vinaya* in Contemporary Korean Buddhism with Reference to the Chogye Order" (2014), and "The Formation of the Bhikṣu Ordination in 19th Century Chosŏn Korea: Focusing on the Ten Wholesome Precepts of the Monk Paekp'a" (2021).

E-mail: jaranglee@hanmail.net

International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture Vol.31, No.1 (June 2021): 115–140

© 2021 Academy of Buddhist Studies, Dongguk University, Korea

<https://doi.org/10.16893/IJBTC.2021.06.30.1.115>

The day of submission: 2021.4.15.

Completion of review: 2021.5.29.

Final decision for acceptance: 2021.6.17.

Abstract

One of the defining characteristics of Korean Buddhism is the concept of “Buddhism as protector of the state.” From the Three Kingdoms period (ca. 300–935) to the Chosŏn period (1392–1910), Korean monks often played major political and military roles when the country was in crisis. This is considered to have been inevitable considering that Korean Buddhism became accepted and established on the Korean Peninsula under the protection of state power.

However, according to two texts on Buddhist precepts important to Korean Buddhism, i.e. the Four-part Vinaya and the Brahmā’s Net Sūtra, the killing of living creatures and the possession of weapons are both strictly prohibited. Any action that would cause the death of a living creature is also strictly banned, and murder is considered the gravest crime of all the precepts. Therefore, if monks or nuns commit murder, it will be a basis for which they will be expelled from the saṃgha. Nevertheless, Korean monks have sometimes actively intervened in times of national crisis as citizens of the state.

What position did Korean monks take in situations where killing was considered inevitable, but such actions were prohibited by Buddhist precepts? This paper examines this question by focusing on the case of Silla monks at a time when the Silla state was in a dire situation during its wars to unite the Three Kingdoms. In effect, in their exegetical writings, Silla monks chose to expand the scope of “acceptable” actions by reinterpreting the precepts forbidding the taking of life and related issues.

Key words: Precept against taking of life, Buddhism as protector of the state, discriminately taking of life, *Four-part Vinaya*, *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra*

Introduction

Although a fundamental moral premise in Buddhism is the injunction against killing living beings, the destruction of human life in war has been all too common in predominately Buddhist countries. Throughout premodern history in East Asia not only have monks actively participated in warfare, but provisions making permissible the taking of human life by monks and lay persons were advanced in exegesis on Buddhist scriptures. Despite the existence of monastic injunctions and regulations, historical records reveal that monks acted at odds to these prescriptions. Of course, there were competing motivations for the monastic actions that developed in contradiction to the prescriptions, a major factor being the state, under whose aims and directives the monastic community had to abide.

From the time that Buddhism came to be regarded as an official state religion receiving patronage from the royal family on the Korean peninsula, the actions of monastics were intimately intertwined with the need for them to be in service to the state. Clear evidence of monastic adjustments to historical circumstances, especially with regard to their relationship to the state, is readily available. For example, a nuanced relationship with the state was evident early in Korean history linked to the Vinaya regulations that prohibit monks from taking part in harming or taking life. The injunctions related to taking life were reinterpreted, perhaps skillfully, to free the monks from any wrong-doing, or from “grave offenses” (Skt. *pārājika*; 波羅夷). This allowed monks to be freed from Vinaya restraints, so as to work in the service of the state—and, if necessary, by their breaching what otherwise would have been the gravest injunction of all.

Two informative historical accounts illustrate the perspectives and the actions of Buddhist monks in early Korean history on the matter of taking of life. This article will focus on the records of the monks' interpretations of the Buddhist prohibitions and related events, from which we can read Buddhist perspectives on this matter. Furthermore, the *History of the Three Kingdoms* (*Samguk sagi* 三國史記) and the *Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms* (*Samguk yusa* 三國遺事) will provide invaluable information on Buddhism in ancient Korean history. These historical accounts of ancient Korea from the Three Kingdoms period and the Unified Silla period reveal evidence of Buddhist reinforcement of state ideology and monastic support of the aims of the state. These consist of the espousal of actions that support the state and the active role of monks in

both the state political and military affairs. It was for this reason that Korean Buddhism has often been referred to as “state-protection Buddhism” (*hoguk Pulgyo* 護國佛教), a term coined by modern scholars of Buddhism.¹

There are two unmistakable historical reference points of Buddhist support of war efforts of the state: the first is in the Silla period during the hostile times in the seventh century, and the second is during the Japanese invasion of the Chosŏn kingdom in the late sixteenth century (1592–1598).² The first set of examples are monks who actively assisted Silla in its war against hostile neighboring states. For instance the eminent monk Wŏn'gwang 圓光 (d. ca. 640) participated in the effort to curry the assistance of the powerful Sui empire when Silla was suffering attacks from the neighboring Koguryŏ kingdom. Wŏn'gwang was asked to compose an official letter on behalf of the Silla ruler requesting that Sui troops be mobilized and sent to the peninsula. In another example, Ŭisang 義湘 (625–702), after finding out about an imminent naval invasion of Silla by Tang China, reportedly returned to his homeland to warn authorities so that the military might prepare. In another case, the eminent monk Wŏnhyo 元曉 (617–686) is reported to have assisted in deciphering a coded message of Koguryŏ's attack plans and helped to save the Silla army from an unanticipated invasion.

The state ideology of the time, accepted and supported by the monks, placed one's state before monastic duties. That this was the case can be discerned from a call to repay one's debt to the state by a Silla monk named Ch'wido 驟徒 (fl. 654–661), who reportedly claimed, “It is better to repay the country by joining the military than being a monk” (*Samguk sagi* 47:448–449 [Ch'wido]). He eventually joined the army rather than donning a cleric's robe and died fighting for the country. In this way, Korean monks actively supported the state both militarily and politically in keeping with the idea of Buddhism as the protector of the state and its people.

The other reference point was during the Japanese invasion of Korea, which began in 1592, during the reign of King Sŏnjo 宣祖 (r. 1567–1608), and lasted seven years until 1598. At the beseeching by King Sŏnjo, the eminent monk Hyujŏng 休靜 (1520–1604) called upon monastics to join the war effort. Many formed monk militias and entered the vicious and bloody battle against the enemy soldiers, while other monks assisted in other ways, such as providing and delivering provisions and furnishing labor to build fortifications. The popular esteem of the monks for their taking part in the war against the

invading Japanese soldiers can be clearly recognized in the text of the memorial stele that was erected for Hyujöng in 1630 as follows:

While cultivating in the mountains,
 [Hyujöng's] sense of loyalty never left the king's side.
 Being summoned as the state fell into crisis,
 The righteous army gathered in throngs like clouds.
 Young [monks] entered the battle and fought the foes,
 The older monks beseeched the power of the Buddha.
 The vile Japanese invaders were vanquished,
 The state and the people, safe and fortunate.
 [Hyujöng] leaving the mountain and having saved the people,
 His name became known even outside Chosön. (Yi 2000, 237–238; translation following Kim 2020, 219)

Similar to what is claimed in this stele text, monastic efforts were recognized as contributing to the defense of the country and, thereafter, was an important factor in cementing social recognition and legitimation of the saṃgha in Chosön (Kim 2020, 218–221).³

The background to this “state protection” role is the fact that Buddhism grew and developed under the protection of state power ever since it arrived in Korea, a country constantly under threat of invasion from neighboring countries. Since monks were also citizens of the state, the monastic community had no choice but to abide by the laws of the state and also pander to the demands of the government. In addition, protecting the country from disasters on which the survival of its own community was dependent, monks had little choice but to actively and willingly participate.

In this paper I examine this very point by focusing on characteristics of early Silla monk's activities and writings. First, I analyze the precept “Be discriminate in the taking of life” (殺生有擇戒) asserted by Wön'gwang, and examine further the underlying intent of this injunction. Through the examination of Wön'gwang's “five secular precepts,” we can confirm his realization of discord wherein he had no choice but to accept the inescapable reality of war while there was also a sense of hesitation in condoning killing as a Buddhist monk.

On the other hand, in commentaries on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* by three

Silla monks active at the time of the unification of the Three Kingdoms, we will examine instructive perspectives on the issues of taking life, possessing weapons, and participation in war. The three commentaries are by Wŏnhyo, Ŭijök 義寂 (fl. 661–692), and T'aehyŏn 太賢 (fl. 742–765). Through these commentaries, I interpret separate criteria used by the Silla monks in an attempt to overcome the gap between realities of war and the doctrinal ideals in the complex situation of the time.

The views advanced by the three monks are historically significant because they set a precedent and had continuing influence in the history of determining allowable actions of monks during war. In other words, the logic or rationale for political and military activities performed by Silla monks provided a pattern for monastic involvement in state affairs during the succeeding Koryŏ (918–1392) and Chosŏn (1392–1910) periods. Through this examination, I hope to uncover the main characteristics of the tradition of precepts in Korean Buddhism. Although similar to reinterpretations of Buddhist doctrine to fit the circumstances of different times and places in other regions, it is worth noting the significance of the events that took place during the unification wars in seventh-century Silla. One of the gravest injunctions against taking the life of another human came to be allowed, freeing the monks from the strict Vinaya restrictions on killing during wars.

Doctrinal Perceptions on Taking Life

Precepts against monastic participation in war and taking human life are clearly laid out in the various Indian Vinaya texts, but the process of being translated into literary Sinitic and transmitted to the Korean Peninsula was a complex process. Nevertheless, the precepts against killing would have been familiar to most Korean monks by the seventh century (McBride 2016). Two texts on Buddhist precepts have been important in the Buddhist Vinaya traditions of China and Korea—the *Four-part Vinaya* (Skt. *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*; Ch. *Sifen lü* 四分律) and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* (Ch. *Fanwang jing* 梵網經), a late fifth-century Chinese compilation (Heirman 2008). It is clearly stipulated in these texts that the killing of living beings, the possession of weapons, and any involvement in war-related matters are strictly forbidden. According to the *Four-part Vinaya*, taking of life is classified as a “grave offense” (Skt. *pārājika*;

波羅夷), the worst offence that monks and nuns can commit. However, the ordinary killing of “living creatures” (生類) is considered to be a minor offense that requires only expiation (Skt. *pāyattika*, Pāli *pācittiya*; 波逸提; Article 61; T 22, no. 1428, 576b26–c1 [斷人命戒], 677a24–25 [奪畜生命戒]). The *Four-part Vinaya* even prohibits a monk to be in any proximity of soldiers and weapons of war, which can be deduced from the prohibition of monks against staying in a military compound (Article 49; T 22, no. 1428, 670a18–19 [軍中過宿]). This article appears to have been enacted in fear that monks will remain in the military for an extended time and intervene in military affairs (Hirakawa 1994, 535).

On the other hand, the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* states that the killing of any living creature by monks or lay Buddhists is a grave offense—the transgression of the very first grave precept (第一重戒) (T 24, no. 1484, 1004b16–20; *ESBN*, 260). Thereafter, the tenth minor precept (十輕戒) is an injunction against amassing of weapons (T 24, no. 1484, 1005c14–19; *ESBN*, 340), and again according to the eleventh minor precept (十一輕戒), a person must not serve as a negotiator for the military (T 24, no. 1484, 1005c20–23; *ESBN*, 341).

Therefore, from Buddhist Vinaya statutory standpoint, it is unacceptable for a monk or a nun to kill, possess weapons, or engage in war-related activities for any reason. This would purportedly include protecting the state or for the preservation of one's religion and Buddhism would not be an exception. Considering these injunctions against the killing of life and even against the association to military activities, why did Korean monks claim that going to war was an inevitable reality, despite these clear injunctions? Although they were citizens of the state, monks could not pretend to be unaware of the situation of chaos and violence in times of war, but at the same time the injunction against killing of human life represents one of the core values of Buddhism demonstrated by the fact it is the worst offence for monks and nuns.

Wōn'gwang's Secular Precept to Discriminate in the Taking of Life

One of first interpretations of the Buddhist precept against killing can be traced to the Silla monk Wōn'gwang, active as a monastic in the early seventh century.⁴ Wōn'gwang is known to have travelled to China to study under Chinese masters, which was not uncommon at the time, and returned during

the time of reign of King Chinp'yōng 眞平 (r. 579–632). Wōn'gwang returned to Silla after having studied in Sui China, and lodged in a monastery at Kasul Point 嘉瑟岬. During this period, Silla was in fierce conflict with the neighboring states of Paekche and Koguryō. Surrounded by two enemy states, Silla was struggling to survive.

After the eminent master Wōn'gwang had returned to Silla, two young men named Kwisan 貴山 and Ch'uhang 籌項 visited him on their way to join the war. They were hoping to receive wise teachings from the famed master on the precepts that one should abide by in life. It is said that the young visitors desired to obtain “life-long lessons” and upon receiving this request, the eminent monk gave them a teaching as follows:

In Buddhism there are the bodhisattva precepts. However, as you are loyal subjects and also the children of your parents, it will be very difficult to follow these ten articles, so I will give you the following “Five Secular Precepts” (*sesok ogye* 世俗五戒): (1) Serve the king with loyalty (事君以忠); (2) serve your parents with filial piety (事親以孝), (3) treat your friends with sincerity (交友以信); (4) do not retreat from battle (臨戰無退), and (5) be discriminating in the taking of life (殺生有擇). You should abide by these injunctions. (T 49, no. 2039, 1002c29–1003a4)

Wōn'gwang presented them the “five secular precepts” because they could not follow the bodhisattva precepts (菩薩戒). Among the five injunctions, the fifth, “Be discriminating in the taking of life” (殺生有擇) condones killing. In other words, killing a living being is sanctioned but with discretion. Here, it can be estimated that the ten bodhisattva precepts given by Wōn'gwang is an adoption from the ten grave precepts (十重戒) and forty-eight minor precepts (四十八輕戒) described in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* (Sin 1998, 102; Y. Chōe 1995, 29).

Since the first grave precept is the “prohibition against killing” (不殺生), Wōn'gwang would naturally have been aware that this precept strictly prohibits killing. Nevertheless, he is teaching these young men to “be discriminating in the taking of life,” implying tolerance of killing. Wōn'gwang seems to have embraced the inevitably reality of the two young men who will join the war as soldiers.

This is a practical teaching in response to the worldly demands of a

kingdom in crisis. In this regard, the Buddhist scholar Nam Tongsin evaluates that Wŏn'gwang's view was faithful to the secular needs to preserve the state and royal power (Nam 1993, 212–213). On the other hand, according to Buddhist scholar Sin Hyŏnsuk, it is also meaningful in that the precept to not retreat from battle comes right before the precept to be discriminating in the taking of life. These precepts reflect Wŏn'gwang's understanding of the need to protect the state by linking it with the precept of not to retreat in battle. Sin Hyŏnsuk argues the precept to be discriminating in the taking of life is a virtue related to the precept to not retreat in battle. Although discriminate killing is a more discretionary form of killing, it nonetheless serves the cause of the state and would have been essential in the preservation of the state when in the midst of war (Sin 1988, 62–63). It is a pragmatic interpretation, although it is an active concession to the necessity of killing when in an urgent war situation. In addition to the precept to not retreat in battle, Wŏn'gwang also included the precept to serve the king with loyalty, an indication of having to be subservient to the ruler.

Wŏn'gwang himself demonstrated his subservience to royal authority when, in 608, King Chin'yŏng requested that Wŏn'gwang compose an official request to the Sui Chinese court for troops. This was to gain the advantage of military aid from the Sui court in Silla's struggle against Koguryŏ. Wŏn'gwang surely understands the monastic precepts against killing, but also his awareness of the place of the saṃgha under state authority and enjoying state patronage, can be observed in his response; "It is not a monk's job to kill others in order to live, but how can I dare not follow the king's order while living in his kingdom and taking the food and water he provides?" (*Samguk sagi* 4:56 [Chin'yŏng 30]).

Wŏn'gwang's view of loyalty to the state and the ruler is understandable given the position of Buddhism in relation to the state. However, Wŏn'gwang was a monk who was arguably expected to put his Buddhist precepts before loyalty to the country. In addition, according to *Samguk yusa*, Wŏn'gwang was fully aware of the bodhisattva precepts based on his activities in edifying the public by preaching the precepts (T 49, no. 2039, 1001c6–1002b7). He was neither ignorant nor indifferent to the precepts.⁵ Judging from these remaining records, Wŏn'gwang took the middle ground of accepting the reality of Buddhism having to be subservient to the state, but yet endeavoring to practice and spread Buddhist-inspired precepts, but in a compromised form. Accordingly, it appears that Wŏn'gwang tried to present the principle of

minimal killing which does not outright reject it but which also does not fully accept it.

In summary, Wŏn'gwang suggests the principle of minimal killing must be applied even in situations where killing is inevitable. In particular, the admonition to “kill only when necessary” can be interpreted as being applicable on the battlefield where killing is inevitable. Wŏn'gwang described this injunction as being “good morals of the secular world” and suggests that people living in the secular world should likewise practice this. However, that does not change the fact that even minimal killing is a violation of the precept to not kill. Nonetheless, as a citizen, Wŏn'gwang could not be indifferent to the situation of war and he tried to find a compromise between secular reality and Buddhist ideals.

In comparison to Wŏn'gwang, other Silla monks who were contemporaries to him but came slightly after him exhibited more flexibility in their interpretation of the Buddhist doctrine based on different criteria for judgement. I now turn to the commentaries on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* by Wŏnhyo and Ŭijŏk.

The Importance of Intent in Killing

Silla monks' interests in the Buddhist teachings were diverse including Huayan 華嚴, Yogācāra 唯識 (Consciousness-only), Pure Land 淨土, and Esoteric Buddhism 密教. There are also many writings on the precepts by Silla monk scholars. Beginning with the *Sabunyul kalma ki* 四分律羯磨記 (Commentary on Karmic Actions in the *Four-part Vinaya*) by Chimyŏng 智明 (fl. 579–632), there were other monks who wrote commentaries on the *Four-part Vinaya* such as Chajang 慈藏 (fl. 636–650), Wŏnsŭng 圓勝 (fl. seventh cen.) and Chiin 智仁 (fl. seventh cen.) during the reign of Queen Sŏndŏk 善德 (r. 632–647) in the first half of the seventh century.

Even though Chajang composed a commentary on Sarvāstivāda-vinaya (Ch. *Shisong lü* 十誦律) and Wŏnsŭng wrote on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, the study of precepts by many Silla monks during the Three Kingdoms period focused on commentaries on the *Four-part Vinaya* (Ch'oe 1999, 36). However, at the start of the Unified Silla (676–935) era, in addition to the *Four-part Vinaya*, there was increased interest in the bodhisattva precepts and the scriptures such as the

Brahmā's Net Sūtra and the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* (Ch. *Yuqie shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論) that expounded on these precepts.

For instance, Wŏnhyo wrote the *Pōmmang-gyōng posal kyebon sagi* 梵網經菩薩戒本私記 (Commentary on the chapter of the bodhisattva precepts in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*; hereafter *Sagi*), and the *Posal kyebon chibōm yogi* 菩薩戒本持犯要記 (Essentials of observing and violating the Bodhisattva *Prātimokṣa*; hereafter *Yogi*). Sūngjang 勝莊 (fl. 703–713) explicated the *Pōmmang-gyōng posal kyebon sulgi* 梵網經菩薩戒本述記 (Commentary on the bodhisattva precepts expounded in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*), in four rolls. Ūjōk 義寂 (fl. 661–692), who was active in the early Unified Silla period, compiled the *Pōmmang-gyōng posal kyebon so* 梵網經菩薩戒本疏 (Commentary on the bodhisattva precepts in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*) and *Pōmmang-gyōng mungi* 梵網經文記 (Writings and commentaries on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*). T'aehyōn 太賢 (also Taehyōn 大賢, fl. 742–765) compiled the *Pōmmang-gyōng kojōk gi* 梵網經古迹記 (Exposition of the ancient traces of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*), the *Pōmmang-gyōng posal kyebon chongyo* 梵網經菩薩戒本宗要 (Doctrinal essentials of the bodhisattva's code of morality in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*), and the *Yuga kyebon chongyo* 瑜伽戒本宗要.

A turning point in the study of Silla Buddhist precepts, which had previously focused on Hīnayāna Vinaya literature, including the *Four-part Vinaya*, came when Buddhist exegetes switched to studying the bodhisattva precepts as presented in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*. This was initiated by Wŏnhyo (Ch'oe 1999, 68). Wŏnhyo was a monk active prior to, during, and after the period when Silla was active in its unifying efforts of the Three Kingdoms. He wrote a number of commentaries on the *Four-part Vinaya* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, among which only his expositions on the bodhisattva precepts of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, the *Sagi* and *Yogi*, exist while his commentaries on the *Four-part Vinaya* are no-longer extant.⁶

Prior to Wŏnhyo, Wōnsūng explicated the commentary of *Pōmmang-gyōng ki* 梵網經記 (Commentary on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*). Because Wōnsūng's commentary is not extant, Wŏnhyo's commentaries on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* greatly influenced later studies. Of the two commentaries Wŏnhyo left behind on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, the *Sagi* directly commented on the ten major and forty-eight minor precepts. Unfortunately, Wŏnhyo's understanding of the forty-eight minor precepts cannot be known because only the first of the work's two rolls has been preserved; the first roll of the *Sagi* deals solely with the ten grave precepts. His basic position on the bodhisattva precepts can be

grasped through his commentary on the ten major precepts.

Among these ten grave precepts elucidated in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, the first grave precept, to not kill, is described as follows:

The Buddha said, “My disciples, if you yourself kill or you incite someone else to kill, or [if] you participate in the planning of a killing, or praise killing, or enjoy seeing someone kill, or kill by magical spells, then you have the causes of killing, the conditions of killing, the method of killing, the act of killing; this holds true up to the accidental killing of any form of life. Bodhisattvas should give rise to an enduring attitude of compassion, an attitude of reverence and obedience, devising skillful means to save and protect all sentient beings. But if, on the other hand, a bodhisattva kills a living creature indulging in enjoyment, then this is a bodhisattva *pārājika* [expulsion] offense.” (T 24, no. 1484, 1004b16–20; *ESBN*, 260)

Therefore, one can assume that all killing is prohibited. Furthermore, Wōnhyo mentions four conditions that determine whether or not an action is a transgression of the precepts. Four verses by Wōnhyo explain keeping and breaking of precepts.

First, even if murder is committed, it can be a blessing and not a transgression. This refers to a case where a bodhisattva who has mastered the spiritual ability to reincarnate and to guide deluded sentient beings to emancipation and enlightenment (*tallyun'gi posal* 達輪機菩薩) kills because it is not possible for them [sentient beings] to be saved or liberated unless they die. Such killing is a blessing and not a transgression. It is said in the scriptures that bodhisattvas once killed 500 brahmans, but the brahmans were not guilty of sin. The bodhisattvas only did it to save and guide them.

Second, some killings are neither a transgression nor a blessing. The precept is not violated if death is the result of karma, of either a mistake or delusion. Third, if it is only light and not heavy, it refers to the case of killing sentient being of inferior quality. Fourth, if it is heavy and not light, this precept refers to a grave precept. Of these four phrases, the first phrase becomes only blessed and not sinful, the next phrase is neither a sin nor a blessing, and the latter two phrases [both] are sins not blessings. (H 1, no. 16, 596c1–11)

Wŏnhyo classifies the criteria for determining whether or not a crime is committed by advancing four categories. In other words, (1) if it is only a blessing and is not a transgression (一向福非罪); (2) a case where it is neither an offense nor a blessing (非罪非福); (3) if it is an offense that is only light and not heavy (唯輕非重); and (4) If it is only a heavy offense and not a light offense (唯重非輕).

In the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, without exception, killing is considered a grave offense. But Wŏnhyo believes one who kills should be judged based on his state of mind or intent. Wŏnhyo uses the descriptive concept of a “bodhisattva that thoroughly understands intentions” (*talgi posal* 達機菩薩) with regard to the case of a criminal offense being a blessing and not an offense. Because the acts of a bodhisattva are for the good of sentient beings, even if it violates a precept, it is considered a blessing, not a transgression. A bodhisattva that thoroughly understands intentions refers to a bodhisattva who has mastered the spiritual abilities enabling it to thoroughly comprehend sentient beings. It is a term unique to Wŏnhyo and appears several times in the *Sagi*.⁷ Even when a bodhisattva violates a precept, it is not a transgression but a blessing because it is an act of judgement regarding what is most beneficial for that sentient being. It is also an “expedient act” to guide deluded sentient beings to emancipation and enlightenment. An act committed in a mental state that cannot be determined to be either good or evil is neither a transgression nor a blessing because there is no consciousness of a transgression.

Wŏnhyo refers to the concept of “innocence without a cause” in the *Sagi*. The Sinograph “*in*” 因 can mean “cause” or “intent” as in “intent” to kill or steal. It implies having the will or mind to do evil. Lee Chunghwan explains, “Wŏnhyo is able to grasp the state of the mind that causes the offense, and says that judging whether or not a precept has been broken depends on the state or intent of each mind” (Lee Chunghwan 2014, 64; “Fulfillment of the conditions for the completion of an action 具緣成業 of the ten grave precepts”; H 1, no. 16, 595c17).

Wŏnhyo's view, which emphasizes the aspect of mind in judging whether a precept has been violated, was supported by the eminent Chinese scholar-monk Tiantai Zhiyi 天台智顛 (538–597) in his *Pusajie yishu* 菩薩戒義疏 (Commentary on the meaning of the bodhisattva precepts), the oldest existing commentary on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*. Zhiyi's influence on Wŏnhyo can be noted from the contents of *Pusajie yishu* which is cited in the *Sagi* and the references made to Zhiyi's commentary as “commentary” 疏 or “commentator”

疏主 when referring to Zhiyi (Yoshizu 1991, 593; Ch'oe 1999, 91–93). However, in the case of Zhiyi, although he values the importance of mind, he does not mention the breaking of a precept based on altruism or a morally indeterminate state of mind, which Wŏnhyo does. It is only in Wŏnhyo's commentary that this concept is advanced.

Therefore, an act committed with the intention of saving other people is not a transgression, even though according to the Vinaya it is a *pārājika* [expulsion] offence. This concept, in fact, appears in the sutras of the Yogācāra School, such as the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*. This treatise explains this point in roll 41 as follows: A bodhisattva sees a fortune-seeking thief who tries to kill a sentient being or a śrāvaka (a direct disciple of the Buddha who heard his voice; voice-hearer 聲聞), a pratyekabuddha (solitary buddha 獨覺, or self-enlightened one). The bodhisattva of great virtue says, “If I cut off the life of that evil being, I would fall into hell; and if I do not end his life, he will attain unremitting [unwholesome] karma and suffer great pain in the future. If I kill him with wholesome thoughts, it is not a transgression of the precept.” Rather, it is said it was an act of meritorious virtue (T 30, no. 1579, 517b6–17).⁸

There were not many cases where Wŏnhyo directly cited the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* in the *Sagi*. However, it is presumed that Wŏnhyo wrote the *Yogi* (a commentary related to Wŏnhyo's bodhisattva precepts) with the intent to harmonize the precepts of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* with the notions of the Yogācāra School (Kimura 1980, 305–309). Therefore, it seems that the influence of the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* is why Wŏnhyo promoted the importance of “intent” when judging if a precept had been broken. Wŏnhyo's interpretation has had great influence on later commentators on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*.

Why Wŏnhyo would advance such an interpretation has been extensively pondered by modern scholars of East Asian Buddhism. Some looked for answers by examining Wŏnhyo's life because he fathered a child with a widowed Silla princess, ceased being a monk, and called himself “Humble Householder” (Sosŏng Kōsa 小姓居士) late in life; thus, he lived a life of neither a monk nor a layman. For example, the Japanese scholar Yoshizu Yoshihide suggested, “Through an independent view about bodhisattvas, such as Wŏnhyo's bodhisattva who thoroughly comprehends intentions (*talgi posal*), if the purpose of breaking a precept is sublime, it can be interpreted as a meritorious action. This is an interpretation that fits Wŏnhyo, a married Buddhist monk bodhisattva” (1991, 621; Ch'oe 1999, 85). On the other hand, we

must consider the milieu in which Wōnhyo lived. Wōnhyo was a monk who was active before and after the unification of the Three Kingdoms. He was of great help when Silla's army, led by the general Kim Yusin 金庾信 (595–673) united with the military forces of Tang China, attacked the Koguryō army. At that time, Wōnhyo received a request from the Silla army to decode the symbolism of a white heron and calf in the picture sent by Tang's general Su Dingfang 蘇定方 (591–667), commander of the Silla-Tang allied troops who helped Silla defeat Koguryō (T 49, no. 2039, 971b4–10). From this, it seems that Wōnhyo, like Wōn'gwang, was patriotic and was not able to ignore his obligation as a citizen of the state, a status he held before becoming a monk. In such a situation, Wōnhyo's emphasis on the importance of intent in deciding whether a precept had been broken or not offers a flexible standard for situations in which there is an inevitable transgression. It widens the scope of actions one can take in following the bodhisattva precepts.

A famous modern scholar-monk Kwōn Sangno 權相老 (1879–1965) emphasized the relationship between war and Buddhism and the tradition of patriotic Buddhism. He insisted:

If [killing] is [morally] right and pure, it can be considered in keeping with the precepts, even though the precepts presented in sutras prohibit it. No matter how hard one tries to abide by the precept against killing, if the purpose and motive [behind killing] are not pure and correct, it cannot be considered in keeping with the precepts. Accordingly, the judgment of whether one has violated the precept against killing or not is determined by one's intention and motive. (Andō 1943, 7–20).

Scholars of modern Korean Buddhism believe that Kwōn Sangno's view was influenced by Wōnhyo's standard of reinterpreting the Bodhisattva precepts.

Allow Lay Buddhists to Possess Weapons and Participate in War

Ŭijōk and T'aehyōn, who were active slightly after Wōnhyo, also wrote commentaries on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*. In their commentaries, we find two distinctive interpretations of tenth minor precept, which forbids amassing weapons that can harm people or other living being, and eleventh minor

precept, which prohibits frequenting military compounds. First, the contents of the two precepts shown in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* are as follows:

My disciples, you should not amass weapons such as knives or clubs, bows and arrows, halberds and axes. All evil instruments that are used to ensnare and kill living beings should not be collected. If bodhisattvas cannot even take revenge for the killing of their father and mother, how can they possibly kill any sentient being. If one intentionally stores knives and clubs, it constitutes a minor transgression of the precepts. (T 24, no. 1484, 1005c14–19; *ESBN*, 340)

The Buddha said, “My disciples, you should not serve as an emissary to a foreign state for self-gain or with evil intentions when it involves the raising of armies who face each other in battle and kill countless sentient beings. Bodhisattvas should not even be involved in military matters—how much worse it would be to turn into a traitor to one’s own country! If you intentionally do such a thing, it constitutes a minor transgression of the precepts. (T 24, no. 1484, 1005c20–23; *ESBN*, 342)

In this way, the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* strictly prohibits killing, the accumulation of killing tools, and political or military intervention, regardless of whether they are a monk or lay Buddhist. There are no allowances. However, in the reality of Silla’s lofty goal to unite the Three Kingdoms, it would not have been easy for the Silla people to keep the precept against killing.

As mentioned in the introduction, Silla monks intervened in military and political issues. As in the case of monk Ch’wido, there were cases in which monks directly participated in war, so it goes without saying that lay Buddhists did also. However, even in the case of lay Buddhists, the precept against killing is one of the five precepts, and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* is about precepts that must be observed, regardless of whether one is a monk or lay Buddhist. However, the commentary on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* mentioned above is noteworthy because it allows lay Buddhists to possess weapons and participate in war-related matters.

First, I examine Ŭijök’s case. Ŭijök, a later figure than Wŏnhyo, was active in the mid-to-late seventh century. His commentary on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* was titled *Posal kyebon so* 菩薩戒本疏. Information on Ŭijök’s life and achievements is limited due to a lack of extant source material, but he did

leave behind writings on Yogācāra topics, so the conventional view is that he was a Yogācāra scholar-monk. In addition, Tojŭng 道證 (fl. seventh–eighth cen.), a disciple of the famous Yogācāra scholar-monk Wŏnch'ŭk 圓測 (613–696), considered Ŭijŏk to be one of the six eminent Yogācāra scholars (Kim 1991, 27–28). According to Ch'oe Wŏnsik, Ŭijŏk cites the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* fifty-eight times in his *Posal kyebon so* (1999, 164). One such passage claims that even if one violates the precepts only in appearance, it is not actually a violation but a merit and is considered a non-transgression (無違犯). This concept from the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* was used in Ŭijŏk's commentary.

For instance, Ŭijŏk included the following commentary about the tenth minor precept in his *Posal kyebon so*.

[Regarding the precept against amassing weapons,] both in Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism, observance of the precept should apply to all religious practitioners and secular people. Nobles, kings, princes, etc. have bows and arrows to prevent the invasions of foreign enemies, so it is reasonable to have weapons to protect oneself from injury. Also, even if they are not people of high social status but have tools and weapons to protect the Dharma, they should also be allowed to have weapons if they have no intent to harm people. In the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, it is said that lay Buddhists are allowed to have weapons for the sake of protecting the Dharma, but they should not kill people. (H 2, no. 36, 278a8-a13)

Ŭijŏk knew very well that both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism prohibited the gathering of weapons for monks and lay Buddhists. However, the nobility took the position that gathering weapons by citizens was inevitable in order to prevent any invasion by foreign enemies. It was also believed that even those not in the ruling class could possess weapons to protect the Dharma. Of course, there was a prerequisite condition that there should be no intent to injure or harm, but the possession of weapons was permitted in some cases. The basis for this view was the *Mahāyāna Nirvāṇa Sūtra*. Because the possession of weapons and killing was prohibited, it may have been presented in the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* as follows:

Even if you possess a sword or club for lawful purposes, I [the Buddha] also call it observing the precepts. Even if you have a sword, you shouldn't take the life

of other living things. So, the view that it was permissible to own weapons may have been based on the phrase ‘the best way to keep the precepts.’ (T 12, no. 374, 384b9-11)

The “Adamantine spirits” chapter 金剛神品 of the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* allows lay Buddhists to possess weapons to uphold and preserve the “true Dharma.” It is also well-known for presenting the view that it is okay for monks to accompany lay Buddhist carrying weapons. “Whoever upholds and maintains the dharma can hold a sword or a bow and arrows, and they must defend monks in keeping with the precepts” (T 12, no. 374, 383b22–24). Furthermore, “Whoever upholds and maintains the true Dharma must hold a sword or weapon in the hand and stay with the preacher/teacher” (T 12, no. 374, 384a25–26). Accordingly, it says that a knife or weapon can be held in hand to protect the true Dharma. This view in the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* is believed to have had a profound influence on the understanding of Silla monks in relation to the violation of the precepts against killing and war.⁹ It is noteworthy that this is actually discussed in Ŭijök’s case.

On the other hand, Ŭijök explains the eleventh minor precept against serving as a negotiator for the military as follows.

For serving as a negotiator for peace and amity, lay people should not be prohibited to enter a military camp.... The reason not to frequent [military camps] is because the battlefield is noisy and complicated, and it is not a [wholesome] place to tread as lay person. If not necessary and an important matter, both monks and lay people are prohibited to enter military camps. If lay people (or believers) become military officers, they cannot be prohibited because they have to show their valor. It is like when the Śākya tribe and Kośala king fight. In the case of renunciant bodhisattvas, they are allowed to stay for two or three days in accordance with the precept when there is a call to abide. (H 2, no. 36, 278b9–21)

In the case of lay Buddhists, they are allowed to enter and exit military compounds for the sake of making peace but not to make war. In addition, even if a lay Buddhist becomes a military officer, it is inevitable that he will enter and exit a military camp. This view was peculiar to Ŭijök, and it does not appear in the writings of the Silla monk Sūngjang, who was active in China,

or the Chinese monk-exegetes Zhiyi and Fazang 法藏 (643–712) (T 12, no. 374, 624a28).

Because Ŭijök was active before and after the unification of the Three Kingdoms, it is highly likely he had seen war firsthand, as well as situations where lay Buddhists carried weapons and went to military camps. However, his interpretation of the precepts is less strict for lay Buddhists. The tenth minor precept and the eleventh minor precept also allow the possession of weapons and entry to military camps in unavoidable circumstances, but only for lay Buddhists.

On the other hand, Silla monk T'aehyön, who was active in the mid-eighth century during the time of King Kyöngdök (r. 742–765), also shows a position similar to that of Ŭijök on these two precepts. First, commenting on the tenth minor precept against amassing weapons, he advances the position that *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* preaches that a king and other state officials should allow lay Buddhists to keep weapons in order to protect the Dharma. T'aehyön explains that possessing weapons was “a minor transgression” when done in order to uphold and preserve the Buddha's true teaching. That is not breaking a precept. Here, I would like to compare the commentaries of these two monks. Ŭijök allows lay Buddhists to possess weapons but prohibits killing. T'aehyön does not mention killing, but emphasizes that it is possible to possess weapons if it is to protect and preserve the true Dharma. In my reading, T'aehyön takes a more active position on the possession of weapons by lay Buddhists than Ŭijök. However, T'aehyön was probably influenced by Ŭijök in terms of interpreting this precept because both cited the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*.

With respect to the eleventh minor precept against serving as a negotiator for the military, T'aehyön says it does not violate the precept if one visits the armies of two opposing countries to persuade them to stop killing each other. On the other hand, Ŭijök's position is that when a lay Buddhist becomes a military officer, military communication or traffic is inevitable. T'aehyön believes that there is no violation of precepts if two countries or armies only interact to make peace.

The interpretations of these two monk-scholars are not completely consistent, but both have aspects in common in that they are interpreting related issues in a way that permits lay Buddhists to possess weapons. This is relevant to the actual situation Silla monks and lay people faced. In other words, in reality, monks sometimes had to intervene and play a role in political

and military matters. And sometimes strict interpretations bound by provisions of the precepts were not possible in wartime. From this point of view, we see both are views that emphasize practical reality.

Conclusion

The state-protection tradition of Korean Buddhism began in Silla during the Three Kingdoms period. Buddhism was actively used to centralize and reinforce royal power in Silla before unification, and monks also actively responded to the national crisis. A primary example is Wŏn'gwang. He “reinterpreted” the precepts to tolerate killing in inevitable situations by presenting the five secular precepts, including injunctions to not retreat from battle and to be discriminating in the taking of life.

In addition, Wŏnhyo himself acted politically for the sake of the country, and suggested the concept of the bodhisattva that thoroughly comprehends intentions as a criterion for judging the violation of a precept, as well as emphasizing intent. Therefore, Wŏnhyo changed the way precepts could be interpreted. In addition, Ŭijŏk and T'aehyŏn reinterpreted related precepts in line with the practical reality and the urgency of the times by tolerating monks engaging in political and military activities, the amassing of weapons by householders, and the entering of military camps. From the standpoint of the precept that forbids both monks and lay Buddhists from killing any living beings, it would be impossible for devout Buddhists to engage in war, nor could they amass weapons. However, in the case of Korean Buddhism, where royal authority trumped Buddhist doctrine, obeying this key precept was difficult for people living under the constant threat of invasion.

Notes

- * This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2011-361-A00008).
- 1 Kim (2012) explains that the concept of *hoguk Pulgyo* was first advanced during the Japanese colonial period; it was the development of the idea of the amalgamating the imperial political system with Buddhism based on the notion of Imperial Buddhism or *Sumeragi-dō Bukkyō* (皇道佛教).
 - 2 Kim (2012, 54–60) argues that in the Chosŏn as well the Koryŏ period, there were many cases in which monks and monk soldiers directly participated in armed battles.
 - 3 Kim (2016, 96–104) adopts the perspective of “clash between loyalty and the precepts” in examining the monastic participation in the war. He points out the historical context surrounding this phenomenon, *viz.*, the urgent war situation at that time. On the other hand, the monk army’s involvement was a good opportunity to silence the criticism of the Confucian scholars against Buddhism as lacking the virtues of filial piety and loyalty.
 - 4 Hereafter, the “no killing precept” part of Wŏngwang’s teaching was reconstructed by partially citing the content of Lee (2014, 29–56).
 - 5 Wŏngwang is said to have thoroughly practiced the precepts and lived a poor and innocent life with only a cassock and an alms bowl, and was respected by many monks and laymen (Ch’ae 1977, 244).
 - 6 Another extant commentary related to precepts is Wŏnhyo’s *Posal yŏngnak ponŏp-kyŏng so* 菩薩瓔珞本業經疏 (Commentary on the Sūtra of the Original Acts That Serve as a Bodhisattva’s Adornments [*Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經], a scripture articulating the bodhisattva precepts that was translated into literary Sinitic between 376 and 378 and which was popular in China beginning in the late fifth century through the seventh century. See Tongguk Taehakkyo Pulgyo Munhwa Yŏn’guso (1976, 26–27).
 - 7 The expression *talgi posal* 達機菩薩 appears seven times (H 1, no. 16, 599b10–11, 600a14, 600b24–c1, 602a9, 602b6, 602c9–10, 603b17), and the related term *tallyun’gi posal* 達輪機菩薩 appears twice (H 1, no. 16, 596c2–3, 598a23).
 - 8 *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* (T 30, no. 1579, 517b6–17). Han Myŏngsuk pointed out that this verse in the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* and Wŏnhyo’s concept of the bodhisattva that thoroughly comprehends intentions (*talgi posal*) are in the same vein. The Yogācāra school, which actively allows expediency against fundamentalist Brahmā’s Net precepts rather than independent interpretation, or *Bodhisattvabhūmi-sūtra* (Ch. *Pusa dīchi jing* 菩薩地持經) and its different version *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* is a system of thought that appears mainly in the Bodhisattva precepts (Wŏnhyo 2016, 30–31).
 - 9 The possibility is pointed out that the connection of this phrase of *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* with the precepts of “Do not retreat from battle 臨戰無退, and Be discriminating in the taking of life 殺生有擇” appeared in Wŏngwang’s Five secular injunctions. See Ahn (1960, 87), Park (1998, 41–43).

Abbreviations

- ESBN *Exposition of the Sutra of Brahma's Net* 梵網經古述記, edited and translated by A. Charles Muller, Collected Works of Korean Buddhism, vol. 11, Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, 2012.
- H *Han'guk Pulgyo chōnsō* 韓國佛教全書 [Complete works of Korean Buddhism]. Comp. Han'guk Pulgyo Chōnsō P'yōnch'an Wiwōnhoe 韓國佛教全書編纂委員會 [Committee for the Compilation of the Collected Works of Korean Buddhism]. 14 vols. Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo Ch'ulp'anbu, 1979–2020]. Available at Han'guk Pulgyo Chōnsō retrieval system, http://ebti.dongguk.ac.kr/ebti/keyword/index_keyword.asp. [Numbering of texts following Project Unit for Archives of Buddhist Culture of the Academy of Buddhist Studies at Dongguk University, *Compendium of the Complete Works of Korean Buddhism* (Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 2015), xvii–xxii.]
- T *Taishō shinsū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 [Revised Buddhist canon compiled during the Taishō reign period]. Eds. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡邊海旭 et. al., 100 vols., Tokyo: Daizōkyōkai, 1924–1935.

References

Primary Sources

- Daban niepan jing* 大般涅槃經 [*Mahāyāna parinirvāṇa-sūtra*]. T 12, no. 374.
- Fanwang jing* 梵網經 [*Brahmā's Net Sūtra*]. T 24, no. 1484.
- Posal kyebon chibōm yogi* 菩薩戒本持犯要記. H 1, no. 15.
- Pōmmang-gyōng posal kyebon sagi* 梵網經菩薩戒本私記. H 1, no. 16.
- Pōmmang-gyōng posal kyebon so* 梵網經菩薩戒本疏. H 2, no. 36.
- Pōmmanggyōng kojōkki* 梵網經古跡記. H 3, no. 47.
- Samguk sagi* 三國史記 [History of the Three Kingdoms]. 50 rolls. By Kim Pusik 金富軾 (1075–1151) completed between 1136–1145; critical apparatus by Chōng Kubok 鄭求福, No Chungguk 盧重國, Sin Tongha 申東河, Kim T'aesik 金泰植, and Kwōn Tōgyōng 權惠永, Kuksa Chōngsō 國史叢書 (National History Series) 96-1. Seoul: Han'guk Chōngsin Munhwa Yōn'guwōn, 1996.
- Samguk yusa* 三國遺事. T 49 no. 2039.
- Sifen lü* 四分律 [Four-part Vinaya]. T 22, no. 1428.
- Yuqie shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論 [*Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*]. T 30, no. 1579.

Secondary Sources

- Andō Shōro
安東相老
(=Kwōn Sangno
權相老)
1943 *Rinsen no Chōsen Bukkyō* 臨戰の朝鮮佛教 [Chosōn Buddhism at War]. Seoul: Mansanhoe.
- An Kyehyōn
1960 “Sillain ūi sesok ogye wa kukkakan: Silla munhwa ūi t'ŭkching ihae rŭl wihan sōsōl” [Silla people's view of the state and the five secular precepts: An introduction for understanding the distinctive characteristics of Silla culture]. In *Han'guk sasang kangjwa* 3, ed. Hanguk Sasang P'yōnch'an Wiwōnhoe, 81-97. Seoul: Koguryō Munhwasa.
- Ch'ae Inhwan
蔡印幻
1977 *Shiragi Bukkyō kairitsu shisō kenkyū* 新羅佛教戒律思想研究 [Research on Thought on the Precepts in Silla Buddhism]. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.
- Chōe Wōnsik
1995 “Wōn'gwang ūi saengae wa sasang: *Samguk yusa* Wōn'gwang ūi punsōk ūl chungsim ūro” [Wōn'gwang's Life and Thoughts: Focusing on the Analysis of Wōn'gwang's Biography section, *Samguk yusa*]. *Taedong kojōn yōn'gu* 12: 1–35.
- 1999 *Silla Posalgye sasangsa yōn'gu* [A Study on the Philosophical History of Silla Bodhisattva Precepts]. Seoul: Mijoksa.
- Funayama Tōru
船山徹
2017 *Higashi ajia bukkyō no seikatsu kisoku Bonmōkyō: saikō no katachi to hattenn no rekisi* [The rules for living in East Asian Buddhism, *Brahmā's Net Sūtra: The Oldest Form and Development History*], Kyōto: Rinsen Shoten.
- Heirman, Ann
2008 “Indian Disciplinary Rules and their Early Chinese Adepts: A Buddhist Reality.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128(2): 257–272.
- Hirakawa Akira
平川彰
1994 *Nihyakugozyukkai no kenkyū III* [A Study of the Two Hundred and Fifty Precepts III]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Ishida Mizumaro
石田瑞麿
2003 *Bonmōkyō* [*Brahmā's Net Sūtra*]. Kyōto: Daizō Shuppansha.

- Kimura Sensho
木村宣彰
1980 “Bosatsu gaihon jibōn yōgi ni tsuite” [On the essentials of observing and violating the *Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa*]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 28(2): 813(305)-817(309).
- Kim Sanghyōn
1991 *Silla Hwaōm sasangsa yōn’gu* [Research on Hwaōm thought in Silla]. Seoul: Minjoksa.
- Kim, Sung-Eun
Thomas
2020 “Re-purposing the Portrayal of Eminent Monks in Memorial Steles: Strategies of Identity Legitimation in 17th Century Korean Buddhism.” *International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture* 30(1): 205–232.
- Kim Yongtae
(Kim Yongt’ae)
2012 “Han’guk pulgyosa ūi hoguk sarye wa hoguk pulgyo insik” [Cases of state protection in the history of Korean Buddhism and the understanding of state protection Buddhism]. In *Han’guk hoguk Pulgyo ūi chejomyōn* [A re-examination of Korea’s state protection Buddhism], ed. Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Pulgyo sahoe yōn’guso, 48-76. Seoul: Chogyejong Ch’ulp’ansa.
- 2016 “Chosōn chōn’gi ūisūnggun chōnt’ong e taehan chaego: hoguk pulgyo ūi Chosōnjōk parhyōn” [A re-examination of the tradition of Chosōn’s Righteous Monk Armies in the early Chosōn period: A Chosōn-oriented manifestation of state protection Buddhism]. *Tongguk sahak* 61: 87-119.
- Lee Chunghwan
李忠煥
(Yi Ch’unghwan,
Pöpchang
[Bub Jang] 法張)
2014. “*‘Bonmōkyō’ chūshakusi no kenkyū*” [A Study of the Commentary History of *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra*]. PhD diss., Hanazono University, Kyōto.
- 2017 “Taiken no kairitsu shisō: Tokuni sanshu jōkai to ‘yugakai’ no eikyō ni tsuite” 太賢の戒律思想：特に三聚淨戒と「瑜伽戒」の影響について [T’aeHyōn’s philosophical thought: Focusing on the influence of the three categories of pure precepts and Yogācāra precepts]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 66(1): 203–208.
- Lee Jarang
(Yi Charang)
2014 “Sesok ogye ūi ‘san saeng yu t’aek kye’ wa Wōn’gwang ūi kyeyulgan” [The Precept of ‘Be discriminating in the taking of life’ in Five Secular Injunctions and Wōn’gwang’s view of the precepts]. *Hanguk sasangsaahak* 46: 29–56.

- Lee Ki-baik (Yi Kibaek) 1986 *Silla sasangsa yŏn'gu* 新羅思想史研究 [Studies in the intellectual history of Silla]. Seoul: Ilchogak.
- McBride, Richard D., II. 2016 “The Complex Origins of the *Vinaya* in Early Korean Buddhism.” *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, 45, nos. 1–2: 151–177.
- Nam Tongsin 1993 “Hanguk kodae pulgyo ūi kukkagwan sahoegwan” [The view of state and society in ancient Korean Buddhism]. *Yŏksa pipyŏng* 25: 204–216.
- Pak Misŏn 1998 “Silla Wŏn'gwang Pŏpsa ūi yŏraejang sasang kwa kyohwa hwaltong” [The *Tathāgatagarbha* thought of Silla Dharma Master Wŏn'gwang and his edification activities]. *Hanguk sasangsabak* 11: 19–54.
- Sin Chongwŏn 1998 “Silla ch'oech'ŏ ūi kosŏng, Wŏn'gwang” [The First Eminent Monk of Silla Period, Wŏn'gwang]. In *Silla ch'oech'ŏ ūi kosŏngdŭl* [Silla's First Eminent Monks], 53–120. Seoul: Minjoksa.
- Sin Hyŏnsuk [Shin Kenshuku] 申賢淑 1973 “Shiragi yuisikigaku no tenseki shōsho” 新羅唯識学の典籍章疏 [The Canonical Texts and its Commentaries of Silla Consciousness-only School]. In *Silla Bukkyō kenkyū* 新羅佛教研究, ed. Kim Chigyŏn [Kin Chiken] 金知見 and Ch'ae Inhwan [Sai Ingan] 蔡印玄, 137–233. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshōrin.
- 1988 “Chŏngt'ogyo wa Wŏn'gwang sesok ogye ūi kochal” [A Study of Pure Land School and Wŏn'gwang's five secular precepts]. *Hanguksa yŏn'gu* 61: 49–66.
- Tongguk Taehakkyo Pulgyo Munhwa Yŏn'guso 東國大學校佛教文化研究所 (Institute for Buddhist Culture at Dongguk University), ed. 1976 *Han'guk Pulgyo ch'ansul munbŏn ch'ongnok* 韓國佛教撰述文獻總錄 [A Comprehensive Catalog of Korean Buddhist Works and Materials], Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo Ch'ulp'anbu.

- Yi Chigwan *Hanguk kosŭng pimun ch'ongjip (Chosŏn p'an-kŭn byŏndae)* 韓國高僧
李智冠, 碑文總集 (朝鮮篇·近現代) [Collection of Korean eminent monk stele
ed. 2000 text (Chosŏn-modern periods)]. Seoul: Kasan Pulgyo Munhwa
Yŏnguwŏn Ch'ulp'anbu.
- Yoshizu Yoshihide “Hōjō izen no Bonmōkyō syotyūshakusyō ni tsuite” [Regarding
吉津宜英 the Commentaries on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* before Fazang (法藏,
1989 643–712) period]. *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 47:
94–119.
- 1991 *Kegon ichijō shisō no kenkyū* [A Study on the Philosophical Thought
of Huayan One Vehicle]. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppan.
- Yun Chonggap “Shiragi Bukkyō no shiseikan to seimeirinri: Gijaku no sesshō
尹鍾甲 muzairon to Taiken no yushoku shi setsuron o chūsin ni” 新羅仏教の
2008 死生観と生命倫理：義寂の殺生無罪論と太賢の由食至殺論を中心に [A
view on life and death and the bioethics of Silla Buddhism: Ūijōk's
theory of innocent killing and Taehyun's theory of killing through
meat eating]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 56(2): 40–47.
- Wŏnhyo *Pōmmang-gyōng posal kyebon sagi sanggwŏn* 梵網經菩薩戒本私記
元曉 上卷. Hangŭlbon Han'guk Pulgyo chŏnsō Silla 13. Trans. Han
2016 Myōngsuk. Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo Ch'ulp'anbu.