

Intention, Knowledge, and Moral Responsibility in Theravāda Buddhist Ethics: A Philosophical Analysis of the Pāli Vinaya

Yen Sokne

Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

Abstract

This article examines how intention, knowledge, perception, ignorance, mistake, and evidential judgment contribute to the attribution of moral and disciplinary responsibility in the Theravāda Pāli Vinaya. Rather than treating monastic discipline as a mechanical code in which an external act automatically produces a fixed result, the study argues that many Vinaya judgments depend upon a structured relation among a rule, relevant facts, mental conditions, exceptions, and valid communal procedure. The analysis is qualitative and philosophical, using selected Bhikkhu Pātimokkha rules, their Suttavibhaṅga explanations, and related procedural materials as primary evidence. It distinguishes technical Vinaya offence from broader moral evaluation and therefore avoids assuming that intention has the same function in every rule. The article develops a five-part model of disciplinary judgment: normative rule, established facts, relevant cognitive and intentional conditions, applicable exceptions, and disciplinary conclusion. It further shows that confession, testimony, investigation, and communal acts extend responsibility beyond private conscience into shared practices of truthful reporting and procedurally accountable judgment. The central conclusion is that the Pāli Vinaya contains a sophisticated practical account of responsible agency in which action is assessed through both conduct and the epistemic conditions relevant to a particular rule. This approach contributes to Buddhist ethics by clarifying the relation between moral agency, knowledge, and institutional responsibility without reducing the Vinaya to a modern legal system.

Keywords: Theravāda Buddhism, Vinaya Piṭaka, Cetanā, Moral Responsibility, Knowledge, Perception, Buddhist Ethics

1. Introduction

Questions of moral responsibility commonly concern more than the visible occurrence of an action. To judge a person responsible is usually to ask what was done, under what circumstances it was done, whether the person acted intentionally, what the person knew or believed, and whether mistake, coercion, ignorance, or some other condition affects the evaluation. Buddhist ethics gives a distinctive account of such questions because conduct is understood in relation to mental qualities, habits, consequences, and the cultivation of liberation. Within this broader ethical setting, the Theravāda Vinaya provides an especially rich field for examining responsibility because it combines normative rules with detailed analyses of circumstances, definitions, exceptions, procedures, and communal forms of judgment.

The Vinaya Piṭaka is not simply a list of prohibitions. Its disciplinary materials include origin narratives, formulations of rules, explanations of technical terms, analyses of offences and non-offences, procedural

requirements, and methods for settling disputes. In the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha, rules are classified according to different levels of disciplinary gravity, but the application of a rule often requires more than identifying an external act. The relevant inquiry may include the object of an action, the agent's perception, the presence or absence of intention, the sequence of conduct, the completion of specified conditions, and any applicable non-offence clause.

This complexity creates a philosophical problem. If responsibility in Vinaya cannot be reduced to the physical description of conduct, what role do intention and cognitive conditions play in determining responsibility? A second problem follows: if mental conditions matter, how are they connected to publicly assessable facts and communal procedure? A third problem concerns the limits of comparison. Modern philosophical discussions distinguish moral responsibility, epistemic responsibility, legal liability, and institutional accountability, but these categories should not simply be projected onto an ancient monastic discipline. The task is therefore interpretive as well as philosophical: contemporary concepts may illuminate patterns in the Vinaya, but they must remain subordinate to the textual structure of the tradition. The principal research question of this article is: How do intention, knowledge, perception, ignorance, mistake, and evidential judgment contribute to the attribution of responsibility in the Theravāda Pāli Vinaya? Four subsidiary questions guide the inquiry. First, how should the relation between *cetanā*, action, and responsibility be understood without assuming that every Vinaya offence is intention-dependent in the same way? Second, how do knowledge and perception function within selected disciplinary judgments? Third, what roles do confession, testimony, investigation, and communal procedure play in establishing responsibility? Fourth, what philosophical model can describe these relationships without reducing the Vinaya to either subjective morality or modern jurisprudence?

The central argument is that the Vinaya presents responsibility as rule-governed but context-sensitive. A disciplinary conclusion emerges from the interaction of a normative rule with established facts and with those mental or contextual conditions that the relevant rule treats as significant. Intention is therefore important but not universally decisive. Knowledge, perception, mistake, and ignorance may alter responsibility where the rule or its analysis makes them relevant. Communal judgment, moreover, requires procedures by which claims can be acknowledged, investigated, remembered, and acted upon. The resulting framework is neither purely internal nor purely external: it connects the ethical formation of the agent with publicly structured forms of disciplinary determination.

This argument is significant for Buddhist philosophy in three ways. It clarifies how ethical agency can be analyzed within a canonical disciplinary system; it shows that responsible judgment requires attention to epistemic conditions as well as conduct; and it provides a basis for comparing Buddhist moral thought with contemporary discussions of agency and responsibility while preserving historical and doctrinal differences. The article does not claim that the Pāli Vinaya contains a modern theory of epistemology or criminal law. It instead uses philosophical analysis to make explicit a pattern of reasoning already present in the disciplinary materials.

2. Related Research and Conceptual Framework

Modern scholarship has approached Buddhist ethics from several complementary directions. Gethin situates ethical discipline within the broader path of Buddhist cultivation [1], while Harvey provides a wide-ranging account of Buddhist moral values and practices [2]. Keown argues for the philosophical seriousness of Buddhist ethics and emphasizes the relation between moral cultivation and the good [3]. These studies help explain why Vinaya cannot be understood merely as administrative regulation:

monastic discipline belongs to a soteriological and ethical project in which conduct, mental training, and wisdom are interconnected.

Historical and textual scholarship has also transformed the study of Buddhist monasticism. Horner's translation of the Pāli Vinaya remains an indispensable English-language resource for the Theravāda disciplinary corpus [4]. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg provided an earlier translation of important Vinaya materials [5]. Schopen challenged idealized accounts of Indian Buddhist monastic life by drawing attention to inscriptions, material evidence, property, ritual, and institutional practice [6, 7]. Clarke further demonstrated that Buddhist monastic institutions must be studied through the diversity of textual and social arrangements rather than through a single simplified model [8]. Although much of this scholarship is not limited to the Theravāda Pāli Vinaya, it reinforces the need to treat monastic discipline as an institutional practice with complex social consequences.

Studies of early Buddhist thought provide a second conceptual background. Jayatilleke examined knowledge and methods of inquiry in early Buddhism [9], while Kalupahana emphasized empiricism, conditionality, and philosophical development [10]. Hamilton and Collins explored questions of personhood, selfhood, and continuity that bear indirectly on agency [11, 12]. Heim gave detailed attention to intention, mind, and agency in Buddhaghosa, showing that Buddhist moral psychology cannot be adequately represented by a single modern category [13]. These works support a cautious philosophical approach in which terms such as intention, knowledge, perception, and responsibility are analyzed in their Buddhist contexts before comparison with contemporary theory.

Contemporary epistemology offers useful comparative vocabulary. Fricker shows that practices of knowing can have ethical and social dimensions, particularly where credibility and testimony are involved [14]. Lackey analyzes testimony as a source of knowledge [15], and Goldberg examines epistemic dependence on others [16]. These theories are not sources for interpreting the historical meaning of Vinaya rules. They are used here only as comparative resources for recognizing that responsible action in institutional settings may depend on truthful communication, reliable testimony, justified reliance, and procedures for correcting error.

The literature nevertheless leaves room for a focused philosophical analysis of how disciplinary responsibility is constructed through the interaction of conduct, intention, knowledge, perception, exceptions, and communal procedure in the Theravāda Vinaya. Scholarship often treats Buddhist ethics at a general level, or Vinaya as history, law, ritual, or institutional regulation. The present study concentrates on the architecture of responsibility itself. Its contribution lies in showing how multiple conditions are coordinated in disciplinary reasoning and in distinguishing the moral importance of intention from the technical conditions by which particular offences are constituted.

Three conceptual distinctions organize the analysis. The first is between moral responsibility and technical disciplinary responsibility. An action may be morally unwholesome in a broad Buddhist sense without constituting a specific Pātimokkha offence, while a technical offence may be determined by conditions that cannot be reduced to a general judgment of character. The second distinction is between private mental states and institutionally established facts. The Vinaya may treat intention, perception, or knowledge as relevant, but communal action still requires a disciplined way of identifying what can appropriately be acknowledged or established. The third distinction is between interpretation and anachronism. Philosophical categories can clarify a textual pattern, but they should not be presented as if the ancient sources themselves used the vocabulary of contemporary analytic philosophy.

3. Research Methodology

This study uses a qualitative textual and philosophical method. Its primary textual field is the Theravāda Pāli Vinaya, especially the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha and the Suttavibhaṅga explanations that contextualize and analyze individual rules. Selected Khandhaka and procedural materials are used where they illuminate confession, communal acts, disputes, or disciplinary settlement. Nikaya material is consulted selectively to clarify the wider ethical significance of cetanā, training, and responsible conduct. English translations are used for accessibility, but Pāli terms are retained where their conceptual significance would be weakened by a single English equivalent [4, 17].

The method has four stages. First, selected rules and procedures are read structurally: rule formulation, relevant definitions, constitutive conditions, exceptions, and non-offence provisions are distinguished. Second, the analysis identifies which factors are treated as normatively relevant in each context, including intention, awareness, perception, mistake, object, effort, completion, and procedure. Third, these factors are compared across examples in order to identify recurring forms of reasoning without assuming uniformity across the entire Vinaya. Fourth, the resulting patterns are reconstructed philosophically as a model of responsibility. The model is explanatory rather than legislative: it does not replace the canonical text or claim authority over living Theravāda interpretations.

The selection of material is purposive rather than exhaustive. The article concentrates on cases that illuminate responsibility, truthfulness, cognition, evidence, and procedure. It does not attempt a rule-by-rule commentary on all 227 Bhikkhu Pātimokkha rules. This limitation is methodologically important because different offence classes and individual rules have distinct constitutive structures. Generalizations are therefore framed cautiously. Where the article states that intention or knowledge can affect responsibility, it means that such factors are significant in relevant rules and analyses, not that they are universal conditions for every Vinaya offence.

The philosophical comparison is controlled by two safeguards. First, canonical and commentarial categories are not translated automatically into modern legal categories such as mens rea, negligence, or strict liability. Such comparisons can occasionally be heuristic, but they can also obscure the religious, communal, and soteriological purposes of Vinaya. Second, the expression epistemic responsibility is used analytically to describe responsibilities connected with knowing, perceiving, remembering, reporting, and judging. It is not presented as a technical Pāli term or as evidence that the Vinaya articulates a modern theory of epistemology.

No human participants, interviews, surveys, personal data, or experimental procedures are involved. The research is entirely textual and philosophical. Its principal limitations are the use of translations, the selective scope of examples, and the difficulty of moving from canonical norm to historical practice. Accordingly, claims about what the Vinaya prescribes are distinguished from broader claims about how Buddhist communities have actually lived or administered discipline.

4. Intention and Moral Agency in Early Buddhist Thought

Cetanā is central to Buddhist accounts of action. In the Aṅguttara Nikāya, the Buddha identifies volition as crucial to kamma, a formulation that has strongly shaped Buddhist moral psychology [17]. Yet the philosophical significance of this teaching must be handled carefully when moving into Vinaya. The moral importance of volition does not entail that every disciplinary offence is defined solely by an agent's intention. Kammic evaluation and technical Vinaya classification overlap, but they are not identical domains.

The distinction can be stated as follows. A broad ethical evaluation asks about the quality of an action as expressive of greed, hatred, delusion, generosity, compassion, restraint, or wisdom. A disciplinary analysis asks whether the conditions specified by a particular rule have been fulfilled. Intention may be one of those conditions, but the rule can also depend on the object, the agent's status, the recipient, the form of communication, the sequence of acts, the completion of an event, or other specified circumstances. Treating intention as the only criterion would therefore collapse the architecture of Vinaya into a general theory of subjective morality.

At the same time, intention is indispensable for understanding agency. A bodily movement that occurs accidentally is not philosophically equivalent to a deliberate act directed toward an object. Deliberation, choice, and purposive effort connect conduct to the agent in a way that mere physical causation does not. Buddhist training repeatedly addresses this connection by requiring practitioners to examine motives, restrain harmful impulses, and cultivate wholesome states. *Sīla* is thus not merely behavioral conformity; it is a disciplined pattern through which bodily and verbal conduct are brought into relation with mental cultivation [1, 2].

Vinaya deepens this relation by placing agency inside a rule-governed communal setting. A monk does not decide privately whether his conduct counts as an offence simply by consulting his own intention. The relevant rule, its definitions, and its exceptions provide a public normative framework. This prevents an overly subjectivist account in which sincere belief automatically cancels responsibility. Conversely, the detailed attention to circumstances prevents an overly external account in which the same physical description always produces the same disciplinary conclusion.

The result is a layered concept of agency. At one level, the agent acts from motives and intentions that have moral significance. At a second level, the action occurs under cognitive conditions: the agent may know, fail to know, perceive correctly, misperceive, remember, forget, or remain uncertain. At a third level, the action is measured against a disciplinary norm. At a fourth level, where communal determination is required, the matter enters a procedural environment involving statements, testimony, acknowledgment, and valid *Saṅgha* action. Responsibility therefore moves from inner motivation to public discipline without reducing either dimension to the other.

This layered structure also explains why habitual training matters. Repeated observance can reshape attention before action occurs. A practitioner who learns to notice relevant conditions, anticipate consequences, and recognize uncertainty becomes less dependent on retrospective excuse. In this sense, Vinaya discipline can be understood as prospective as well as retrospective: it does not merely classify misconduct after the fact but trains the agent to become more careful, truthful, and contextually aware before acting.

5. Knowledge, Perception, Ignorance, and Mistake in Vinaya Responsibility

Knowledge is not a single condition in the Vinaya. Depending on the rule, what matters may be awareness of an object's nature, recognition of a person's status, understanding of a circumstance, or consciousness that one is performing a specified act. Perception likewise concerns how an object or situation is apprehended by the agent. These factors matter because action is mediated by how the situation appears to the person acting. Yet their disciplinary significance is rule-specific. The same type of ignorance may excuse in one context, reduce responsibility in another, or be irrelevant where the rule is structured differently.

This point is crucial for philosophical interpretation. A modern reader may be tempted to construct a universal formula in which responsibility equals action plus intention plus knowledge. The Vinaya resists such simplification. Its casuistic method is closer to conditional reasoning: if specified conditions are present, a particular disciplinary result follows; if a relevant condition is absent or an exception applies, the result may change. The structure is therefore systematic without being reducible to one mental test. Perception is especially important because it stands between external fact and subjective belief. A person may encounter an object that has one status while perceiving it as having another. The philosophical question is then whether responsibility tracks the actual object, the perceived object, or a combination of both. Vinaya analyses frequently distinguish cases according to such differences. The significance of these distinctions is not that the Vinaya embraces a general theory of epistemic justification, but that disciplinary judgment recognizes the moral and practical difference between acting under accurate and inaccurate apprehension.

Mistake must also be distinguished from carelessness. A genuine error may occur despite reasonable attention, while another error may arise because the agent failed to exercise the caution expected by training. The canonical materials do not always formulate this distinction in modern terminology, and it would be anachronistic to import a complete negligence doctrine. Nevertheless, the training framework encourages a form of epistemic vigilance: one should learn the rules, attend to circumstances, ask when uncertain, and avoid acting casually where disciplinary consequences are foreseeable.

Ignorance is similarly ambiguous. Not knowing a rule, not knowing a fact, and not understanding the significance of a situation are different epistemic failures. A mature disciplinary system cannot treat all three as identical. The Vinaya's pedagogical structure addresses ignorance prospectively through instruction, recitation, explanation, admonition, and communal memory. The Uposatha recitation of the Pātimokkha is therefore not merely ceremonial repetition; it also helps maintain a shared normative field in which members are reminded of standards and invited to examine their conduct [4, 18].

The relationship between knowledge and responsibility also reveals why truthfulness matters. If disciplinary judgment depends on facts that are not directly observable, the community may rely on acknowledgment, testimony, memory, or investigation. False reporting can therefore damage more than interpersonal trust; it can corrupt the epistemic basis of communal judgment. Conversely, truthful confession and accurate testimony help align institutional decisions with what actually occurred. This connection between truthfulness and disciplinary validity is one of the strongest reasons for analyzing Vinaya through the lens of epistemic responsibility.

The philosophical lesson is not that knowledge always excuses or condemns. It is that responsible judgment must identify which cognitive condition the relevant rule makes significant. This requires interpretive discipline. One must resist both moralism, which assumes that bad intention settles every technical question, and formalism, which assumes that external conduct can always be classified without attention to cognition. The Vinaya instead coordinates normative text, factual circumstances, and rule-specific mental conditions.

6. From Conduct to Responsibility: A Five-Part Model of Vinaya Judgment

The preceding analysis can be reconstructed as a five-part model: normative rule, established facts, relevant cognitive and intentional conditions, applicable exceptions, and disciplinary conclusion. This model is not offered as a canonical formula. It is a philosophical abstraction designed to clarify the reasoning implicit in many Vinaya analyses.

First, there is the normative rule. Responsibility cannot be determined without identifying the correct disciplinary provision. The wording of the rule establishes the basic normative frame, but the Suttavibhaṅga and related materials often clarify terms and distinguish circumstances. A responsible interpreter therefore begins with the rule in its canonical context rather than with a generalized moral intuition.

Second, there are established facts. What happened? Who acted? What object, person, property, communication, or procedure was involved? Did the relevant event reach completion? These questions matter because a rule applies to specified circumstances rather than to an abstract intention detached from action. Facts constrain interpretation by preventing the disciplinary conclusion from becoming merely subjective.

Third, there are relevant cognitive and intentional conditions. Did the agent intend the act? What did the agent know? How was the object perceived? Was there doubt, mistake, confusion, or another state recognized by the rule's analysis? The word relevant is decisive. The model does not require every mental condition to be investigated in every case. Only those conditions that bear upon the constitution or classification of the particular offence should affect the conclusion.

Fourth, applicable exceptions and non-offence conditions must be considered. A rule system that identifies prohibitions without identifying exceptions would be incomplete because superficially similar conduct can occur under importantly different circumstances. Non-offence clauses show that Vinaya reasoning includes boundary conditions. They protect the integrity of discipline by preventing overextension of a rule beyond the circumstances for which responsibility is assigned.

Fifth, a disciplinary conclusion is reached. The conclusion may identify an offence of a particular class, a lesser offence, or non-offence. In communal matters, however, the conclusion may also depend on procedural validity. A correct substantive judgment reached through an invalid communal act can create a different institutional problem. Vinaya therefore links responsibility not only to what decision is made but also, in relevant contexts, to how a decision is formally produced.

The model can be expressed schematically as: Rule + Established Facts + Relevant Mental Conditions + Exceptions + Valid Procedure = Disciplinary Determination. The plus signs do not imply that every component carries equal weight in every case. They indicate that responsibility is relational: a conclusion is justified by coordinating several kinds of information under the governing rule.

This model helps explain proportionality without imposing a modern penal theory. Vinaya classifications distinguish levels of disciplinary gravity, and the path from fact to classification depends on the elements established. The philosophical importance of this structure lies in its resistance to indiscriminate judgment. One does not move directly from moral disapproval to the most serious disciplinary conclusion. Instead, the relevant conditions must be identified and the rule applied with precision.

The model also clarifies the role of uncertainty. Where facts are unclear, responsible judgment should not manufacture certainty. Where the rule is misunderstood, interpretation must precede classification. Where testimony conflicts, the reliability of claims becomes relevant. This does not mean that the Vinaya supplies a modern evidentiary code. It means that communal discipline presupposes an epistemic problem: decisions must be based on some account of what is known, acknowledged, remembered, or reasonably established.

7. Confession, Testimony, Investigation, and Communal Judgment

Vinaya responsibility is not confined to the moment of action. It extends into practices through which mis-

conduct is acknowledged, discussed, corrected, and, where necessary, adjudicated. Confession is especially significant because it joins moral self-recognition with communicative accountability. To confess is not merely to experience private remorse; it is to present one's conduct truthfully within a disciplinary relationship. This gives confession both ethical and epistemic importance.

The epistemic dimension of confession is straightforward. A community cannot respond appropriately to conduct that remains deliberately concealed. A truthful acknowledgment supplies information that may otherwise be unavailable. Yet confession should not be romanticized as infallible. Memory can fail, descriptions can be incomplete, and a person may misunderstand the relevant rule. The value of confession therefore lies not in replacing interpretation but in enabling responsible interpretation by bringing the conduct into a shared normative space.

Testimony raises a related issue. Human communities inevitably depend on information supplied by others. Contemporary epistemology has emphasized that testimony is a major source of knowledge and that dependence on speakers involves questions of credibility, trust, and responsibility [19, 10]. In Vinaya contexts, testimony must be approached through the specific procedural rules rather than through modern epistemology, but the comparison helps illuminate why truthful speech is institutionally significant. A disciplinary community that cannot rely on basic norms of truthful reporting cannot reliably establish facts.

Investigation becomes important where acknowledgment is absent, facts are disputed, or the situation is complex. The Vinaya contains procedures for handling disputes and disciplinary matters, including the seven *adhikaraṇa-samatha* principles for settling issues. These procedures demonstrate that communal order cannot depend solely on spontaneous moral intuition. It requires recognized methods for bringing disputes to resolution [4, 19].

Saṅghakamma adds a procedural dimension to responsibility. A formal act of the Saṅgha depends on conditions such as proper assembly, motion, announcement, and absence of disqualifying procedural defects according to the relevant Vinaya provisions. Philosophically, this means that institutional legitimacy is partly procedural. A community is not authorized to reach any result by any method simply because members believe the result to be morally desirable. Discipline includes rules governing the exercise of communal authority.

This procedural dimension guards against two opposite dangers. The first is arbitrariness: decisions based on status, anger, favoritism, or pressure rather than on recognized norms. The second is privatization: the belief that each individual can settle disciplinary questions solely by personal conviction. Vinaya procedure instead constructs a shared field of accountability in which individual conscience and communal norm are mutually related.

The relation between truth and procedure is particularly important. Procedure without truthful information can produce formally regular but substantively mistaken outcomes. Truthful information without valid procedure may fail to generate a legitimate communal act. Responsible judgment therefore requires both epistemic integrity and procedural integrity. The former concerns the quality of acknowledgment, testimony, memory, and factual determination; the latter concerns the authorized manner in which the Saṅgha acts.

This dual integrity can be understood as a form of institutional ethics. The Vinaya trains individuals, but it also regulates the community as a decision-making body. The ethical quality of the institution depends on members who are willing to report accurately, listen carefully, distinguish knowledge from assumption,

and follow valid procedure. Responsibility is thus distributed across agents and practices rather than located exclusively in a single private mental state.

8. Philosophical Discussion

The analysis supports a conception of Vinaya responsibility that is simultaneously normative, contextual, epistemic, and procedural. It is normative because rules establish standards that are not reducible to personal preference. It is contextual because the application of a rule depends on circumstances and constitutive conditions. It is epistemic because knowledge, perception, testimony, memory, and factual determination can affect responsible judgment. It is procedural because communal authority is exercised through regulated forms.

This combination complicates familiar oppositions between rule-based and virtue-based ethics. Vinaya is unmistakably rule-governed, yet its rules are embedded in a training directed toward character, restraint, mindfulness, honesty, and wisdom. A monk who merely seeks technical loopholes while cultivating deception would fail to embody the ethical purpose of discipline even if a particular technical offence could not be established. Conversely, good character does not authorize a practitioner to disregard explicit disciplinary norms. Rules and virtues therefore function at different but interconnected levels.

The analysis also complicates a simple internalist theory of responsibility. If responsibility depended only on intention, an agent's private account of motivation could dominate judgment. Vinaya prevents this by connecting mental conditions to public norms and observable circumstances. Yet it also resists a purely externalist approach because some rules distinguish cases according to knowledge, perception, intention, or mistake. The resulting picture is relational: responsible agency emerges at the intersection of inner orientation, external conduct, normative classification, and communal accountability.

A comparison with contemporary epistemic responsibility is useful but limited. Fricker emphasizes that epistemic practices can involve injustice when speakers are unfairly discredited [14]. Lackey and Goldberg show that knowledge often depends on testimony and social relations [15, 16]. Vinaya likewise recognizes that communal judgment depends on what people say, know, remember, and establish. But the purposes differ. Contemporary epistemology typically asks about knowledge, justification, credibility, or epistemic norms in general; Vinaya is oriented toward monastic training, communal harmony, purity of discipline, and liberation. The comparison should therefore illuminate structure without erasing purpose. A comparison with modern legal responsibility is similarly limited. Terms such as intent, evidence, procedure, and offence can make Vinaya sound juridical, and some analogies are genuinely informative. Yet the Saṅgha is not simply a state court, Pātimokkha rules are not a criminal code, and confession is embedded in a religious discipline rather than merely in coercive adjudication. Sanctions, restoration, communal standing, and training operate within a distinctive soteriological institution. The safest philosophical approach is functional comparison: identify similar problems of responsibility while preserving differences in authority, purpose, and social form.

The five-part model developed above also has implications for contemporary Buddhist institutional life. New technologies, financial systems, communication media, and organizational structures create situations not described in ancient narrative settings. Responsible interpretation cannot simply declare that novelty cancels discipline. Nor should it mechanically equate every modern object with an ancient one. The method suggested by Vinaya reasoning is to identify the governing principle, establish relevant facts, examine rule-specific conditions, consider recognized exceptions and standards, and proceed through

legitimate communal interpretation. This is not unrestricted adaptation; it is disciplined contextual reasoning.

The same model has value for moral education. Training in responsibility requires more than memorizing prohibited acts. It requires learning how to notice relevant circumstances, distinguish knowledge from assumption, recognize uncertainty, report truthfully, and accept correction. These are epistemic virtues in a broad philosophical sense, but in Vinaya they remain embedded in ethical discipline. Knowledge is valuable because it supports right conduct; truthful reporting is valuable because it supports accountability; careful judgment is valuable because it protects both individuals and the Saṅgha from careless accusation or careless exoneration.

A further implication concerns institutional trust. Trust is not generated by secrecy or by the claim that religious authority is beyond question. It is strengthened when procedures are intelligible, allegations are handled carefully, members are expected to speak truthfully, and conclusions are proportionate to established conditions. Although ancient Vinaya cannot be treated as a ready-made governance manual for modern organizations, its combination of personal discipline and procedural accountability offers a philosophically significant model of how ethical institutions depend on reliable practices of knowing and judging.

9. Major Findings

The study produces six principal findings. First, intention is morally central in Buddhist thought but should not be treated as the sole universal criterion of Vinaya offence. Technical disciplinary responsibility is determined by the constitutive structure of the relevant rule. Second, knowledge and perception matter in rule-specific ways. Their significance lies in how they connect the agent's cognitive relation to a situation with the normative classification of conduct.

Third, mistake and ignorance are not philosophically uniform. Ignorance of a rule, ignorance of a fact, misperception of an object, and uncertainty about a circumstance represent different epistemic conditions. The Vinaya's detailed case analysis cautions against treating them as interchangeable excuses. Fourth, non-offence clauses and exceptions are integral to disciplinary reasoning because they define the boundaries of rules and prevent overgeneralization.

Fifth, confession, testimony, investigation, and communal procedure show that responsibility is socially mediated. A disciplinary community requires practices through which relevant facts can be truthfully communicated and institutionally assessed. Sixth, the five-part model developed in this article—rule, established facts, relevant mental conditions, exceptions, and valid procedure—offers a useful philosophical reconstruction of Vinaya judgment. It explains how monastic discipline can be both rule-governed and context-sensitive without collapsing into either rigid formalism or unrestricted subjectivism. Taken together, these findings support the broader claim that the Theravāda Vinaya contains a practical architecture of responsible agency. Ethical responsibility is sustained not only by restraint at the moment of action but also by careful perception, truthful acknowledgment, accurate communication, disciplined interpretation, and valid communal decision-making.

The findings should be interpreted within the study's textual scope. The analysis does not claim that every Pātimokkha rule gives identical weight to intention, knowledge, or perception, nor does it infer historical monastic practice directly from canonical prescriptions. The proposed model is therefore a philosophical reconstruction of recurring disciplinary reasoning rather than a universal formula for all Vinaya cases.

10. Conclusion

This article has examined the relation among intention, knowledge, perception, mistake, evidence, and moral responsibility in the Theravāda Pāli Vinaya. Its principal conclusion is that disciplinary responsibility cannot be understood through a single factor. The external act matters, but so may the object, circumstances, intention, awareness, perception, completion of specified conditions, exceptions, and procedural setting. Which of these factors is decisive depends on the structure of the relevant rule.

The analysis therefore rejects two reductions. The first reduces Vinaya to subjective intention, as though good or bad motivation alone determined every disciplinary result. The second reduces Vinaya to mechanical rule application, as though cognitive and contextual conditions never mattered. The canonical disciplinary method instead coordinates rule and circumstance. This coordination is what makes careful interpretation necessary.

The article has also argued that responsibility extends beyond the individual act into practices of confession, testimony, investigation, and communal determination. These practices reveal an epistemic dimension of discipline: responsible communities must distinguish what is known from what is assumed, what is truthfully acknowledged from what is concealed, and what has been validly established from what remains uncertain. Procedural validity complements this epistemic integrity by regulating how communal authority is exercised.

The five-part model—normative rule, established facts, relevant cognitive and intentional conditions, applicable exceptions, and valid procedure—summarizes this architecture. It should not be mistaken for a replacement of the canonical text. Its purpose is philosophical clarification. It makes visible how disciplinary conclusions depend on relations among norm, fact, mind, exception, and institution.

Future research can extend this analysis in three directions. A rule-by-rule study could test the model across different Pātimokkha categories. Comparative work could examine how Theravāda commentarial traditions refine questions of intention, perception, and offence. Contemporary institutional research could investigate how Vinaya communities reason about new technologies and social conditions while maintaining canonical continuity. Such work would deepen understanding of Buddhist moral agency without sacrificing the historical specificity of monastic discipline.

The broader philosophical contribution of the Vinaya lies in its refusal to separate moral formation from responsible judgment. Discipline requires learning how to act, but also how to know, report, interpret, and decide responsibly. In that sense, the Vinaya presents ethical integrity and epistemic integrity as mutually supporting dimensions of a disciplined communal life.

References

1. Gethin, R. (1998). *The foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford University Press.
2. Harvey, P. (2000). *An introduction to Buddhist ethics: Foundations, values and issues*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Keown, D. (2001). *The nature of Buddhist ethics*. Palgrave.
4. Horner, I. B. (Trans.). (1938–1966). *The book of the discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka) (Vols. 1–6)*. Pali Text Society.
5. Rhys Davids, T. W., & Oldenberg, H. (Trans.). (1881–1885). *Vinaya texts (Vols. 1–3)*. Clarendon Press.
6. Schopen, G. (1997). *Bones, stones, and Buddhist monks: Collected papers on the archaeology, epigraphy, and texts of monastic Buddhism in India*. University of Hawai'i Press.

7. Schopen, G. (2004). *Buddhist monks and business matters: Still more papers on monastic Buddhism in India*. University of Hawai'i Press.
8. Clarke, S. (2014). *Family matters in Indian Buddhist monasticisms*. University of Hawai'i Press.
9. Jayatilleke, K. N. (1963). *Early Buddhist theory of knowledge*. George Allen & Unwin.
10. Kalupahana, D. J. (1976). *Buddhist philosophy: A historical analysis*. University Press of Hawaii.
11. Hamilton, S. (2000). *Early Buddhism: A new approach: The I of the beholder*. Curzon Press.
12. Collins, S. (1982). *Selfless persons: Imagery and thought in Theravāda Buddhism*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Heim, M. (2014). *The forerunner of all things: Buddhaghosa on mind, intention, and agency*. Oxford University Press.
14. Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.
15. Lackey, J. (2008). *Learning from words: Testimony as a source of knowledge*. Oxford University Press.
16. Goldberg, S. C. (2010). *Relying on others: An essay in epistemology*. Oxford University Press.
17. Bodhi, Bhikkhu. (Trans.). (2012). *The numerical discourses of the Buddha: A translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya*. Wisdom Publications.
18. Wijayaratna, M. (1990). *Buddhist monastic life: According to the texts of the Theravāda tradition* (C. Grangier & S. Collins, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
19. Thanissaro Bhikkhu. (2013). *The Buddhist monastic code I: The Pāṭimokkha training rules translated and explained* (3rd ed.). Metta Forest Monastery.