International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
Impact Factor 2025: 7.089

The Philosophy of the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha: Buddhist Moral Education for Peace and Social Harmony

Sokne Yen

PhD Scholar, Department of Philosophy, University of Delhi, Delhi, India
Corresponding Author Email: *yensokne168[at]gmail.com*

Abstract: ***The Bhikkhu Pātimokkha offers a distinctive resource for examining how moral education connects individual conduct with communal peace. This study investigates its educational significance within Theravāda Buddhist philosophy through a qualitative interpretation of selected Vinaya rules and related Nikāya teachings. It distinguishes the recited disciplinary code from its canonical explanations and from the wider procedures of the Vinaya. The analysis develops an account of sīla as the cultivation of responsible conduct supported by attention to intention, knowledge of circumstances, acknowledgment of wrongdoing, and shared standards. Monastic training builds practical discernment as well as restraint, as shown by rules against injury, fraud, baseless charges and evasive ignorance. Uposatha recitation and procedures for settling disputes show how personal responsibility acquires an institutional setting. These resources support a qualified contribution to peace education through non-harm, truthful communication, accountable correction, and cooperation. Their application beyond the monastery requires critical adaptation because monastic jurisdiction, religious commitments, and historical hierarchies differ from the conditions of plural educational communities. The paper concludes that the Pātimokkha provides a philosophically defensible model of disciplined moral learning, while its contribution to social harmony remains a normative possibility requiring educational design and empirical evaluation.***

Keywords: Bhikkhu Pātimokkha, Buddhist moral education, peace education, ethical responsibility

1. Introduction

Peaceful communal life requires people to restrain harmful conduct and institutions to respond fairly when that restraint fails. Buddhist moral education addresses these concerns through training in conduct, attention, and understanding. Within Theravāda monasticism, the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha gives this training a recurring public form. Its received enumeration contains 227 items arranged in eight classes, including the seven principles for settling disciplinary issues. The code regulates the life of fully ordained monks and is interpreted through the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga and the wider Vinaya [1]. Its significance for education therefore extends beyond knowing a list of prohibitions. It concerns how practitioners learn to recognize morally relevant circumstances, answer for their actions, and continue living with others under shared standards.

The canonical explanation of the first pārājika rule connects the establishment of training rules with the welfare and comfort of the Saṅgha, the restraint of misconduct, confidence among supporters, the endurance of the teaching, and support for training [2] (section 5.11). These purposes place individual discipline within a communal relationship. Monks' actions affect other practitioners and the wider community that sustains monasticism. This relationship makes the Pātimokkha important to philosophical concerns related to ethical duty and societal harmony. Here again we meet a challenging educational question: how can a disciplinary code develop reflective moral agency without making obedience the exclusive criterion of a decent person?

There are several places to start the scholarship on Buddhist ethics. Keown defends the idea of the centrality of ethics in Buddhism. He uses Aristotelian ethics to analyze the structure of Buddhism [3]. Harvey's work, in turn, sheds light on the moral foundations of Buddhism and its relevance to contemporary societal issues, highlighting the need of applying universal principles to concrete situations [4]. Prebish's treatment of the Vinaya places monastic discipline within the study of Buddhist ethics [5]. Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu's detailed exposition makes the distinctions among rules, explanations, exceptions, and disciplinary consequences especially accessible [1]. These approaches help explain why moral character and disciplinary judgment belong together. The present paper concentrates on a narrower problem: what educational relationship can be reconstructed between the training of a monk and the maintenance of peaceful communal life?

Contemporary peace education provides a useful point of comparison. UNESCO's 2023 Recommendation connects education for peace with critical reflection, responsibility, inclusion, and the protection of human rights [6] (paragraphs 5–8). These commitments offer criteria for considering educational applications of a religious discipline. They do not establish that the Pātimokkha historically expressed the same project. A philosophical comparison must preserve differences in purpose, membership, and authority.

This study asks how sīla relates restraint to understanding, how selected rules educate responsibility, and under what conditions these resources may inform peace education. Its argument is that the Pātimokkha supports disciplined moral learning when rules are explained through their purposes, interpreted with attention to circumstances, and sustained by accountable communal procedures. This contribution is limited. A text can supply reasons for an educational practice without proving that the practice produces peaceful behavior. The discussion therefore distinguishes canonical

prescriptions, philosophical interpretation, and proposed educational applications throughout.

2. Research Approach

The study uses qualitative textual interpretation and philosophical analysis. Its primary corpus consists of selected passages from the Theravāda Vinaya and related discourses from the Majjhima and Aṅguttara Nikāyas. Rules were selected purposively because they illuminate harm, truthfulness, knowledge, responsibility for learning, acknowledgment of offenses, or the resolution of disagreement. This is a thematic investigation rather than an exhaustive analysis of all 227 items or a systematic review of modern scholarship.

Three textual levels are distinguished. The Pātimokkha supplies the recited formulations and classifications. The Bhikkhuvibhaṅga provides origin narratives, explanations, case distinctions, and exceptions. The Khandhakas explain procedures that cannot be reconstructed from the concise code alone. Related discourses clarify ethical purposes without automatically functioning as legal definitions of particular offenses. English translations by Brahmali and Sujato are read alongside the explanatory work of Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu. Pāli terms are retained where an English equivalent might conceal a distinction. Sīla is used for ethical conduct and its cultivation; sikkhāpada for a training rule; and āpatti for a disciplinary offense. These terms overlap in practice but do not denote the same thing.

The analysis asks what conduct each passage regulates, what circumstances matter for responsibility, and what kind of learning its application requires. It then reconstructs the educational significance of these requirements. For example, a distinction between deliberate deception and sincere error can support an argument for careful self-assessment. That educational interpretation remains distinguishable from the rule's own disciplinary classification. Finally, proposed applications are assessed for consistency with the original ethical purpose and with the freedom and dignity of learners outside a monastic setting.

This method yields interpretive findings and normative proposals. It does not determine the chronology of formation of the code, measure modern monastic observance or identify causal consequences on conflict. Canonical descriptions of communal procedures are treated as normative accounts rather than records showing that every historical community followed them. References identify rules or discourse sections so that the relevant reasoning can be checked independently. No interviews, experiments, or observations of human participants form part of the study.

3. Sīla and Responsible Moral Agency

3.1. Conduct and the purpose of training

Sīla concerns the quality of conduct within a path directed toward liberation. AN 10.1 describes skillful ethics as supporting freedom from regret and, through further developments, concentration and liberating knowledge [7]. The educational implication is that conduct shapes the conditions under which understanding becomes possible. A person repeatedly engaged in deception or harm has practical reasons for anxiety, defensiveness, and distraction. Ethical training seeks a way of living in which attention can become less burdened by such conflicts. This is a reconstruction of the discourse's moral logic, rather than a clinical claim about the psychological effects of religious observance.

A disciplinary rule can make a commitment stable by specifying what practitioners should refrain from doing. Nevertheless, knowing that an act is prohibited does not exhaust understanding why it matters. The prohibition against intentionally killing a human being, for instance, gives protection of life a decisive place in monastic discipline [8]. The prohibition has an identifiable object and a particular disciplinary gravity. Its educational significance includes learning to recognize another person's vulnerability and to resist treating that person's life as an instrument of one's preferences. Reflection on the protected interest helps explain the rule without replacing its specific formulation.

Many Pātimokkha provisions also regulate conventions of renunciant life. Their purposes include simplicity, propriety, and workable relationships with supporters. These functions should be examined on their own terms. It would be misleading to argue that every departure from a monastic convention necessarily causes an immediately identifiable injury. The educational value of the code depends partly on learning to distinguish the seriousness, purpose, and conditions of different rules [1]. Such distinctions allow commitment to a discipline to coexist with reasoned explanation.

3.2 Intention and knowledge in moral judgment

AN 6.63 identifies intention as central to kamma and relates intentional activity to body, speech, and mind [9] (section 33). This teaching makes the agent's orientation morally relevant. An action performed to deceive differs from a sincere statement that happens to be mistaken. Yet an appeal to a good intention cannot settle every question of disciplinary responsibility. Vinaya provisions specify different combinations of conduct, object, perception, knowledge, and result. Those combinations must be examined rule by rule [1].

Pācittiya 61 concerns the intentional killing of an animal and illustrates how recognizing it as a living being affects the disciplinary analysis [10]. Pācittiya 51, concerning alcohol, contains a different structure: drinking an alcoholic substance can incur the specified offense even when the monk perceives it as non-alcoholic, subject to the provision's stated exceptions [11]. These examples prevent an overly simple inference that sincere ignorance always removes disciplinary liability. They also prevent the opposite inference that every unfortunate outcome establishes the same degree of fault. Responsible judgment requires attention to what the particular rule actually conditions.

MN 61 supplies a broader educational practice. Rāhula is instructed to examine bodily and verbal actions before, during, and after acting, considering their potential or actual harm to himself and others. When a harmful bodily or verbal action has occurred, disclosure and future restraint are prescribed

[12] (sections 9–14). This pattern connects prospective care with retrospective responsibility. A learner must anticipate consequences, remain capable of changing course, and review what happened. It provides an ethical orientation within which rule learning can become a practice of judgment.

4. The Pātimokkha as Moral Education

4.1 Learning through rules and cases

The Bhikkhuvibhaṅga presents rules in connection with narratives and interpretive distinctions. Whatever historical questions these accounts raise, their educational form gives readers situations to examine. A concise rule identifies a boundary; explanations show which facts affect its application. This combination makes ethical learning more demanding than recitation alone. The learner must connect a formulation with concrete conduct and explain why a case falls within, or outside, the provision [1].

This form can support practical reasoning when teachers invite learners to identify the relevant act, the person or object affected, and the conditions of responsibility. Two cases may have similar outward consequences while differing in intention or awareness. Conversely, two actions prompted by a benevolent motive may differ in their risks or disciplinary status. Discussing such differences can develop sensitivity to circumstances without making personal preference the standard of correctness. The common rule provides a point of reference against which reasons can be examined.

The possibility of educational benefit does not mean that every way of teaching the Vinaya achieves it. A teacher who rewards only memorized classifications may leave students unable to explain the protected interests. A teacher who substitutes general moral enthusiasm for textual precision may neglect the discipline's actual requirements. The proposed pedagogical balance is to teach formulations accurately, explain their purposes, and test understanding with cases. This is an educational proposal arising from the textual form, not evidence about how every monastery teaches.

4.2 Responsibility for learning

Pācittiya 73 addresses an evasive claim of ignorance made during the recitation of the training rules. Its analysis considers prior exposure and the circumstances in which a monk is charged with deception; it also distinguishes disciplinary consequences before and after that formal step [13]. The provision therefore needs more care than the general assertion that ignorance is always punishable. Its immediate target is a form of evasion within an established setting of learning and accountability.

The philosophical point is that responsibility can concern how a person responds to available opportunities to learn. Someone who knows that a shared undertaking has rules cannot reasonably treat every later reminder as wholly unexpected. However, this argument carries an institutional obligation as well. If a community expects informed participation, it should make its standards intelligible and provide opportunities to ask questions. The latter requirement is a normative educational inference; it is not a claim that Pācittiya 73 itself states a modern right to instruction.

Teaching this provision responsibly therefore requires distinguishing inability, confusion, and deliberate evasion. Learners need a way to admit that they do not understand without immediately being accused of dishonesty. Otherwise the pressure to appear knowledgeable may reward concealment. An educational practice directed toward responsibility should make genuine inquiry possible while challenging attempts to use professed ignorance to avoid an acknowledged obligation.

4.3 Truthfulness and epistemic care

Pācittiya 1 regulates deliberate false speech [14]. Pārājika 4 gives particular gravity to falsely claiming a superior human attainment and includes an exception for overestimation in its formulation [15]. Read together, these provisions show why truthfulness requires attention to the relation between what a speaker says and what the speaker takes to be the case. The protection of trust is especially important where claims to spiritual attainment may affect the confidence and support of others.

Sincere error and intentional deception should consequently be distinguished in moral education. This distinction does not remove the responsibility to assess one's claims carefully. A learner may need to ask whether an interpretation is warranted, whether a memory is reliable, or whether a report is being presented with more confidence than its grounds support. The educational aim is a habit of stating what one knows with appropriate accuracy, admitting uncertainty, and correcting errors when they become apparent.

Saṅghādisesa 8 gives this responsibility an explicitly interpersonal setting. It concerns a hostile, groundless accusation that another monk has committed an offense entailing defeat. The explanation distinguishes grounds involving what has been seen, heard, or suspected [16]. A ground for raising an accusation should not be confused with conclusive proof that the accused is guilty. The provision supports a disciplined concern about the basis and motive of accusation. It offers no justification for dismissing every complaint that begins with uncertainty.

This distinction matters for peace education. False accusations can damage reputations and relationships; silencing responsible complaints can protect actual wrongdoing. An educator should therefore teach learners to examine evidence and to separate reporting a concern from deciding guilt. Such an application extends beyond the rule's original jurisdiction, but retains its attention to responsible speech. A peaceful community requires credible ways to raise difficult questions as well as reasons to refrain from malicious allegations.

4.4 Recitation and the acknowledgment of wrongdoing

The Uposatha procedure brings individual conduct into a recurring communal setting. The account in Khandhaka 2 requires attentive listening and the revelation of remembered offenses; under the stated procedure, silence is taken as a declaration of purity [17] (section 3). This is a conventional

practice of accountability. It does not give the community infallible access to another person's conduct or inner state. Its reliability depends in part on honest memory, understanding, and disclosure.

Repetition can make moral commitments easier to recall at the moment of action. Publicly shared standards can also prevent responsibility from becoming entirely private. Nevertheless, the recitation has educational value only when participants understand what their silence or speech signifies. A ceremony performed without comprehension may preserve a form while weakening its practical purpose. The code's demand for attention therefore matters as much as its regularity.

Acknowledgment of wrongdoing should be connected with the response appropriate to the offense and with future restraint. The various classes of offense do not have interchangeable remedies. Confession applicable to certain offenses does not reverse a pārājika defeat, and more serious disciplinary matters require their own procedures [1]. The educational lesson is proportionate accountability. A willingness to acknowledge fault is valuable, but it does not by itself remove consequences or settle what must be done for those affected.

5. Peace and the Conditions of Social Harmony

5.1. Non-harm and cooperative life

The connection between discipline and peace begins with restraints that make living together less threatening. Rules against murdering and intentional lying are rules that serve interests that matter for trust and security. These restraints are necessary elements of a peaceful relationship, although their observance does not establish that every need or grievance has been addressed. A community can refrain from overt violence and still leave people afraid to speak, unable to obtain help, or excluded from decisions that affect them.

The Nikāya account of harmony adds positive relationships to restraint. MN 48 describes kindness in bodily, verbal, and mental conduct, sharing legitimately obtained resources, and common commitment to ethical conduct and liberating understanding [18] (sections 6–7). These qualities explain why harmony involves practices of care and cooperation. Their immediate setting is a community of practitioners sharing a path. Applying them elsewhere requires distinguishing kindness and fair sharing from the expectation that everyone accept the same religious view.

For this paper, social harmony means a sustainable capacity to cooperate, address grievances, and protect people from avoidable harm while allowing disagreement. This is an analytical definition used for the educational discussion. It does not translate a single Pāli expression or describe all historical Theravāda societies. The definition also provides a critical test: apparent agreement produced through intimidation fails the proposed standard because it prevents the responsible expression of concerns.

5.2 Disagreement and fair settlement

The seven adhikaraṇasamatha principles recognize that communal problems require different forms of settlement [19]. They include resolution in the presence of the relevant parties, acting according to what is admitted, and majority decision under appropriate conditions. The concise list belongs to the Pātimokkha, while the detailed procedures require the wider Vinaya. This distinction matters because a philosophy of peace cannot be reconstructed from prohibitions alone. Communities also need ways of handling uncertainty and contested accounts.

Khandhaka 14 places conditions on the proper use of voting, including the relationship between the anticipated outcome and the Dhamma [20] (sections 9–10). Numerical support therefore does not function as an unrestricted authorization. The philosophical lesson concerns the limits of collective power: a decision procedure requires standards by which its exercise can be assessed. This feature should not be redescribed as equivalent to modern constitutional democracy. It nevertheless provides material for reflecting on why procedure and substantive justification belong together.

MN 104 combines an account of the roots of dispute with methods of settlement and qualities conducive to harmony [21]. It treats conflict as a problem to be understood and handled, rather than assuming that membership in a religious community removes disagreement. For education, this suggests teaching how to identify a dispute, hear the relevant account, and select a response suited to the issue. A disagreement over interpretation, an accusation of misconduct, and an admitted offense should not automatically receive the same treatment.

5.3 Reconciliation and the limits of closure

Some disputes can become more destructive if every minor offense committed during a quarrel is pursued separately. The procedure described as covering over with grass permits a specified form of communal settlement. Its canonical limits matter: the account in MN 104 excludes offenses that are gravely blameworthy and those connected with laypeople [21] (section 20). This is not a general authorization to conceal serious wrongdoing for the sake of unity.

The distinction gives a precise limit to appeals for harmony. Reconciliation is educationally defensible when it addresses the relevant wrongs through an appropriate process. It becomes defective when those affected are pressured to remain silent or when closure protects the reputation of an institution at their expense. This judgment is a normative application of the preceding analysis, rather than a claim that an ancient procedure already contains every element of contemporary safeguarding.

Peace education informed by the Vinaya should consequently examine the grounds and limits of forgiveness, disciplinary response, and restored cooperation. It should ask who is entitled to participate in a settlement and whether the proposed remedy responds to the actual issue. The aspiration to end a quarrel does not make every means of ending it ethically acceptable. A community's willingness to face an

uncomfortable allegation may be a condition of trustworthy harmony.

6. Educational Applications

6.1 A proposed practice of moral inquiry

The preceding interpretation supports a sequence of educational activities that could be adapted to adult monastic study or to an academic course on Buddhist ethics. A session would begin with a short textual case and the rule or discourse relevant to it. Learners would identify the interests at stake and the facts needed for judgment. They would then consider changes to the case, explain how those changes affect responsibility, and propose a response. A final reflection would ask what the example reveals about their own habits of attention or speech.

For a case involving a false report, the teacher might distinguish a knowingly invented claim from a mistaken but honestly corrected statement. Learners could examine what each speaker knew, whether the claim should have been checked, and how correction should reach those who received it. The exercise would use the distinction between deception and error without pretending that ordinary students fall under monastic jurisdiction. The proposed learning outcome is the ability to give a reasoned account of responsibility.

A second exercise could involve disagreement over shared resources. Participants would identify each person's concerns, hear competing accounts, and distinguish an unresolved factual question from a disagreement about allocation. The discussion could draw on the canonical emphasis on sharing and on the need for appropriate settlement. Its success would depend on whether participants understand the reasons for a response and can consider another person's position. Agreement alone would provide an inadequate assessment criterion.

These activities are proposals for educational design. They have not been implemented or evaluated as part of this study. Evidence of effectiveness would require an appropriate study of learners' understanding and behavior, including attention to whether participants feel able to disagree with the teacher. The textual argument supplies reasons to investigate these practices; it does not substitute for that investigation.

6.2 Adaptation to plural educational communities

A monastic community and a public classroom have different conditions of membership. The Pātimokkha regulates fully ordained monks within a religious discipline. A plural classroom includes learners with different beliefs and varying relationships to authority. Its curriculum can study the discipline and examine its ethical insights without asking students to accept monastic status or Buddhist liberation as their own goal. This distinction is central to any responsible adaptation.

UNESCO's Recommendation calls for freedom of thought, conscience, belief, and religion alongside inclusive education [6] (paragraph 8). In a course informed by Buddhist sources, this means that students should be able to compare arguments and decline religious practices without educational penalty. A teacher can explain why sīla matters within Theravāda philosophy while allowing its assumptions to be questioned. The aim is informed moral inquiry in which a tradition contributes reasons that remain open to examination.

Some forms of monastic accountability also require careful adaptation. Classroom reflection should not become compulsory public confession. Learners require privacy, appropriate expectations and appropriate mechanisms for help-seeking. Hypothetical cases, voluntary reflection, and discussion of reasons can serve educational purposes without demanding disclosure of intimate experiences. Allegations of harm require competent institutional procedures rather than an improvised attempt to reproduce a monastic ceremony.

7. Critical Limits of the Argument

Several limits follow from the method and the materials. First, a philosophical reading of normative texts cannot establish the conduct of actual communities. The existence of detailed disciplinary provisions is compatible with failures of implementation. Claims that Theravāda practice has produced harmony in a particular place require historical or empirical evidence that this study does not supply. The argument concerns a resource for education and the conditions of its defensible use.

Second, the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha concerns a particular monastic body. It does not by itself provide a complete account of women's monastic lives or of lay moral education. A broader educational application should include the perspectives of bhikkhunīs, laywomen, laymen, and people affected by institutional decisions. This extension is a requirement of the proposed educational setting, rather than a claim that the bhikkhu code already represents every voice equally.

Third, the relation between authority and learning remains a practical difficulty. Clear standards can protect a community, but their interpretation can be controlled by people whose decisions are difficult to challenge. Critical discussion, competent instruction, and credible complaint procedures are therefore necessary to the educational proposal. Without them, the vocabulary of discipline and harmony could be used to discourage the very honesty it is supposed to cultivate.

Finally, personal virtue cannot provide a sufficient response to every cause of social conflict. Unequal access to resources, exclusion, and institutional power also require attention. The Pātimokkha offers a focused account of training within renunciant communal life, not a complete policy for modern societies. Its most powerful contribution to peace education is in explaining how conduct, judgment and accountability can encourage cooperation. Further work should test that contribution in specific settings and examine its limits through dialogue with other ethical traditions.

8. Conclusion

The Bhikkhu Pātimokkha can be interpreted as a resource for moral education because it places conduct within a sustained practice of learning and communal responsibility. Its rules

require attention to circumstances, while related discourses connect ethical training with reflection on harm and the cultivation of understanding. The analysis of deception, evasive ignorance, and unsupported accusation shows that responsible conduct depends partly on how people learn, assess claims, and acknowledge what they have done.

Uposatha recitation and the settlement of disciplinary issues give this responsibility an institutional form. Their educational significance includes repeated attention, proportionate correction, and procedures appropriate to different kinds of conflict. The resulting conception of harmony permits difficult questions to be raised and rejects the concealment of serious wrongdoing in the name of agreement.

These findings support a qualified contribution to peace education. A curriculum for ethical inquiry can be provided by textual cases, meditation on implications and reasoned debate of conflicts. Religious liberty, student privacy, and the special duties of schools must be respected when they are used beyond the monastery. Whether such practices improve understanding or reduce harmful behavior remains an empirical question. The philosophical contribution is a defensible account of how disciplined moral learning may help sustain trustworthy cooperation.

References

[1] Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu, The Buddhist Monastic Code I: The Pāṭimokkha Rules Translated and Explained, dhammatalks.org. [Online]. Available: https://www.dhammatalks.org/vinaya/bmc/Section0001.html
[2] Vinaya Piṭaka, Bhikkhuvibhaṅga, Pārājika 1, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-bu-vb-pj1/en/brahmali
[3] D. Keown, The Nature of Buddhist Ethics, Macmillan, London, 1992. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-22092-2
[4] P. Harvey, An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics: Foundations, Values and Issues, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511800801
[5] C. S. Prebish, "The Vinaya," in The Oxford Handbook of Buddhist Ethics, D. Cozort and J. M. Shields, eds., Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 96–115, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198746140.013.25
[6] UNESCO, Recommendation on Education for Peace and Human Rights, International Understanding, Cooperation, Fundamental Freedoms, Global Citizenship and Sustainable Development, adopted 20 November 2023, Paris. [Online]. Available: https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-education-peace-and-human-rights-international-understanding-cooperation-fundamental
[7] Aṅguttara Nikāya 10.1, Kimatthiya Sutta, Sujato, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/an10.1/en/sujato
[8] Vinaya Piṭaka, Bhikkhuvibhaṅga, Pārājika 3: Killing a Human Being, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-bu-vb-pj3/en/brahmali
[9] Aṅguttara Nikāya 6.63, Nibbedhika Sutta, Sujato, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/an6.63/en/sujato
[10] Vinaya Piṭaka, Bhikkhuvibhaṅga, Pācittiya 61: Intentionally Killing a Living Being, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-bu-vb-pc61/en/brahmali
[11] Vinaya Piṭaka, Bhikkhuvibhaṅga, Pācittiya 51: Drinking Alcohol, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-bu-vb-pc51/en/brahmali
[12] Majjhima Nikāya 61, Ambalaṭṭhikarāhulovāda Sutta, Sujato, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/mn61/en/sujato
[13] Vinaya Piṭaka, Bhikkhuvibhaṅga, Pācittiya 73: Deception, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-bu-vb-pc73/en/brahmali
[14] Vinaya Piṭaka, Bhikkhuvibhaṅga, Pācittiya 1: Lying, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-bu-vb-pc1/en/brahmali
[15] Vinaya Piṭaka, Bhikkhuvibhaṅga, Pārājika 4: Falsely Claiming a Superhuman Quality, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-bu-vb-pj4/en/brahmali
[16] Vinaya Piṭaka, Bhikkhuvibhaṅga, Saṅghādisesa 8: Making a Groundless Accusation out of Anger, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-bu-vb-ss8/en/brahmali
[17] Vinaya Piṭaka, Khandhaka 2, Uposathakkhandhaka, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-kd2/en/brahmali
[18] Majjhima Nikāya 48, Kosambiya Sutta, Sujato, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/mn48/en/sujato
[19] Vinaya Piṭaka, Bhikkhuvibhaṅga, Adhikaraṇasamatha 1–7: Settling Legal Issues, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-bu-vb-as1-7/en/brahmali
[20] Vinaya Piṭaka, Khandhaka 14, Samathakkhandhaka, Brahmali, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/pli-tv-kd14/en/brahmali
[21] Majjhima Nikāya 104, Sāmagāma Sutta, Sujato, trans., SuttaCentral. [Online]. Available: https://suttacentral.net/mn104/en/sujato

Author Profile



Sokne Yen is a PhD scholar in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Delhi, India. His research interests include Theravāda Buddhist philosophy, the Vinaya, Buddhist ethics, and the relationship between knowledge and moral responsibility.