An Integrated Framework Linking Thai Law on Theft and the Second Pārājika Rule (Dutiyapārājika) in Theravāda Buddhism for Peaceful Coexistence

Phramaha Bunlers Phumen
International Buddhist Studies College. Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University

Corresponding author email: Boonloed1234@gmail.com
Received 15/07/2026; Revised 07/09/2026; Accepted 07/09/2026

Abstract

This qualitative comparative study examines Thai law on theft and the Second Pārājika rule (Dutiyapārājika) in Theravāda Buddhist monastic discipline and develops an integrated framework for peaceful coexistence. The study had three objectives: (1) to analyze the development and principles of Thai law on theft in relation to ethical responsibility and property protection; (2) to analyze the development and principles of the Second Pārājika rule, with particular attention to its ethical and disciplinary foundations; and (3) to develop an integrated framework linking the two normative systems. The research combined qualitative documentary analysis with semi-structured expert interviews involving ten purposively selected informants with expertise in Buddhism and law. The research analyzed documentary and interview data through directed content analysis, thematic coding, and comparative synthesis.

The findings show that Thai theft law and the Second Pārājika rule share a concern with protecting property and restraining wrongful taking, but they differ in legal status, jurisdiction, evidentiary structure, and consequences. Thai criminal law requires dishonest taking and applies no minimum property-value threshold for the basic offense, whereas a Pārājika determination under the Vinaya depends on specific conditions including ownership, knowledge, intention, action, and the prescribed value threshold for a defeat offense. The analysis also identifies procedural tension when state detention measures affect monastic status before a final criminal judgment. The study contributes a coordination framework that distinguishes secular criminal adjudication from Vinaya disciplinary determination while promoting communication between legal and ecclesiastical authorities. Recommendations concerning statutory amendment, preliminary Vinaya review, and specialized training are presented as normative proposals derived from the comparative analysis and expert interviews rather than as conclusively established legal requirements.

Keywords: Dutiyapārājika; Thai law on theft; Buddhist Vinaya; Saṅgha Act; Legal pluralism; Procedural justice; Peaceful coexistence.

Introduction

Human societies use multiple normative systems to regulate conduct, protect rights, and resolve conflict. State law establishes publicly enforceable rules, while religious communities may also maintain internal disciplinary systems with distinct sources of authority, procedures, and consequences. In Thailand, Buddhist monks are subject to both state law and monastic discipline under the Vinaya and the institutional framework of the Buddhist Saṅgha. This creates a form of legal pluralism in which secular, ecclesiastical, and monastic norms operate simultaneously rather than as a single legal order (Borchert, 2022; Schonthal, 2022).

The relationship becomes particularly sensitive when a monk is accused of a criminal property offense. Thai criminal law determines criminal liability as a matter of state jurisdiction, while the Vinaya determines whether a monk has committed a monastic offense and whether that offense affects continuing eligibility for bhikkhu status. The Second Pārājika rule concerns taking what has not been given and, when all conditions for a defeat offense are fulfilled, entails irreversible loss of monastic status (Horner, 2014; Payutto, 2018). These two systems therefore address related conduct but apply different legal concepts, procedures, and sanctions.

A central structural issue concerns the timing and legal basis of compulsory renunciation of monkhood. Under the Sangha Act, B.E. 2505 (1962), as amended, Section 29 authorizes an investigation officer, in specified custody-related circumstances, to proceed with compelling a monk to renounce monkhood; Section 30 applies where a monk is to be imprisoned, confined, or detained pursuant to a court judgment or court order (National Office of Buddhism, 2021). These provisions do not determine Vinaya guilt. They instead create a procedural intersection between state custody and monastic status. The 2018 arrests of senior monks brought this intersection into public debate (Bangkok Post, 2018), while later Thai legal scholarship has questioned how Sections 29 and 30 should operate in relation to due process, ecclesiastical participation, and the presumption of innocence (Charoonchart, 2021; Wongwangphoem & Khwayotha, 2025).

The significance of this problem extends beyond individual cases. Premature conflation of criminal accusation, state custody, and Vinaya defeat

may affect the procedural interests of accused monks, the disciplinary autonomy of the Saṅgha, and public confidence in both legal and religious institutions. At the same time, monks cannot be placed outside the jurisdiction of Thai criminal law. The analytical problem is therefore not whether state law or Vinaya should prevail absolutely, but how each system can perform its proper function without one being mistaken for the other.

Existing scholarship has examined Thai criminal law, Buddhist monastic discipline, compulsory disrobing, and the governance of the Saṅgha, while legal-pluralism research has shown that Buddhist monastic communities frequently operate within overlapping normative regimes (Borchert, 2022; Charoonchart, 2021; Schonthal, 2022; Voyce, 2007). However, comparatively less attention has been given to a structured framework that compares the substantive elements of theft under Thai law with the Second Pārājika rule and then separates criminal adjudication, Vinaya determination, and institutional coordination. This gap matters because apparent agreement at the level of ethical purpose can conceal important differences in property-value thresholds, intention, jurisdiction, and consequences. The present study addresses this gap through documentary analysis and expert interviews and develops an integrated framework intended to support procedural fairness, institutional clarity, and peaceful coexistence.

Research Objective

1. To analyze the development and principles of Thai law on theft in relation to ethical responsibility and property protection.
2. To analyze the development and principles of the Second Pārājika rule (Dutiyapārājika) in Theravāda Buddhism, with particular attention to its ethical and disciplinary foundations.
3. To develop an integrated framework linking Thai law on theft and the Second Pārājika rule for promoting peaceful coexistence.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this study falls into four interrelated areas: the social and legal function of theft law; the Second Pārājika rule and Buddhist monastic jurisprudence; legal pluralism and Saṅgha governance; and procedural concerns arising when state custody affects monastic status. Legal philosophy treats law as an institutional framework for defining prohibited conduct, protecting legitimate interests, and resolving competing claims (Chekeevong,

2004; Hobbes, 1996; Kasemsap, 1996). Under the Thai Penal Code, the basic offense of theft is defined in Section 334 as the dishonest taking of property belonging to another person or jointly owned by another. General criminal intent is addressed by Section 59 (Thailand, 1956). Thus, Thai theft law focuses on state-defined criminal liability, dishonest intent, and legally protected property interests.

Within Theravāda Buddhism, the Vinaya regulates monastic conduct through a distinct disciplinary system. The Second Pārājika rule concerns adinnādāna, taking what has not been given. The Vinaya analysis identifies conditions relevant to disciplinary liability, including that the property belongs to another, the monk knows that it belongs to another, there is an intention to steal, the property meets the relevant value threshold for a defeat offense, and the monk performs an act sufficient to complete the taking (Horner, 2014; Oldenberg, 2005). A completed Pārājika offense is not a temporary punishment but a status consequence: the offender is no longer eligible to remain a bhikkhu. Lesser conduct may fall under lesser Vinaya offenses. This graded structure is essential to any comparison with secular criminal law.

The two systems therefore overlap in subject matter but not in institutional identity. Scholarship on Buddhist law emphasizes that Vinaya can function as a sophisticated normative and adjudicative system within the monastic community (Voyce, 2007). More recent legal-pluralism research likewise shows that Buddhist monastic governance may involve the interaction of religious law, state law, and ecclesiastical regulation rather than a simple opposition between ‘law’ and ‘religion’ (Borchert, 2022; Schonthal, 2022). This perspective is particularly relevant in Thailand, where monks are citizens subject to criminal law while also being members of a religious institution governed by the Dhamma-Vinaya and the Sangha Act.

The contemporary procedural issue is most visible in Sections 29 and 30 of the Sangha Act. The official English translation published by the National Office of Buddhism states that Section 29 permits an investigation officer to proceed with compulsory renunciation of monkhood in specified circumstances concerning arrest, provisional release, and custody, while Section 30 addresses imprisonment, confinement, or detention pursuant to a court judgment or order (National Office of Buddhism, 2021). Thai scholarship has criticized aspects of these provisions and proposed greater ecclesiastical involvement or alternative custody arrangements, but such proposals remain normative legal arguments

rather than settled interpretations of what justice requires (Charoonchart, 2021; Wongwangphoem & Khwayotha, 2025).

The literature therefore establishes the need for conceptual separation. Thai criminal law determines state criminal liability; Vinaya determines monastic disciplinary status; and the Sangha Act regulates institutional consequences at the interface between state and ecclesiastical administration. The research gap lies in connecting these domains through a comparative framework that identifies substantive similarities and differences before proposing procedural coordination. This study responds by comparing the elements, purposes, and consequences of Thai theft law and the Second Pārājika rule and by using expert interviews to examine the practical implications of their intersection.

Scope of Research

1. Scope of data sources: Primary legal sources included the Thai Penal Code, especially Sections 59 and 334 and related property-offense provisions, and the Sangha Act, B.E. 2505 (1962), as amended, especially Sections 29 and 30. Primary Buddhist sources included the Vinaya Piṭaka materials concerning the Second Pārājika rule, consulted through the Pali Text Society editions and translations by Horner (2014) and Oldenberg (2005). Secondary sources were selected for direct relevance to Thai theft law, Vinaya discipline, Saṅgha governance, legal pluralism, procedural justice, and peaceful coexistence.

2. Scope of content: The study examined (1) the historical development and legal principles of Thai theft law, (2) the origin, elements, ethical basis, and disciplinary consequences of the Second Pārājika rule, and (3) points of convergence, divergence, and procedural tension relevant to an integrated framework.

3. Key informants: Ten experts were purposively selected for their relevant experience in Buddhism, Buddhist monastic discipline, and law. The sample comprised five monastic scholars and five lay academics.

4. Interview instrument: A semi-structured interview guide was reviewed by three experts for content relevance and consistency using a four-point rating scale. The review refined question wording and ensured coverage of the three research objectives before data collection.

Research Methodology

Research Design. The study used a qualitative comparative design consisting of documentary research and semi-structured expert interviews. Documentary analysis was the primary method for identifying the legal and Vinaya rules relevant to theft, while interviews explored expert interpretations of procedural tension, institutional competence, and possible coordination between secular and ecclesiastical systems.

Document Selection and Data Collection. The legal corpus included the Thai Penal Code provisions governing intention and theft, especially Sections 59 and 334, together with related property-offense provisions where needed for context; the Sangha Act, B.E. 2505 (1962), as amended through the current official English translation, especially Sections 29 and 30; and relevant Thai legal scholarship. The Buddhist corpus centered on the Second Pārājika rule in the Vinaya Piṭaka and authoritative Pali Text Society editions and translations (Horner, 2014; Oldenberg, 2005), supplemented by modern Theravāda explanatory works. Secondary literature was included when it directly addressed monastic law, Thai criminal procedure, Saṅgha governance, legal pluralism, or procedural justice.

Expert Interviews. Ten key informants were selected purposively for their relevant expertise in Buddhism, Buddhist monastic discipline, and law. The sample comprised five monastic scholars and five lay academics. Semi-structured interviews focused on: (1) the substantive principles of theft in Thai law; (2) the ethical and disciplinary foundations of the Second Pārājika rule; (3) the distinction between criminal guilt and Vinaya guilt; (4) concerns arising when state custody affects monastic status; and (5) feasible mechanisms for coordination. The interview component was interpretive rather than statistically representative, and no numerical generalization to the wider population was attempted.

Data Analysis. Documentary materials were analyzed through directed content analysis. Relevant passages were coded under the categories of purpose, protected interest, act requirement, mental element, property/value condition, decision-making authority, procedure, sanction or status consequence, and institutional scope. Interview records were then coded thematically for recurring issues concerning procedural timing, fairness, Vinaya competence, institutional autonomy, and coordination. Comparative matrices were used to identify

convergence, divergence, and potential points of institutional interaction between the two normative systems.

Synthesis and Framework Development. Results were synthesized objective by objective. Objective 1 was answered from Thai legal sources; Objective 2 from Vinaya and Theravāda disciplinary sources; and Objective 3 through comparative analysis informed by expert themes. Normative recommendations, such as possible statutory amendment, preliminary Vinaya review, or specialized training, were separated from descriptive findings so that the article does not present policy preferences as empirically proven legal requirements.

Research Findings

Objective 1: Development and Principles of Thai Law on Theft

Thai law developed from customary, royal, moral, and later codified legal traditions into a modern civil-law system. For this study, the key point is not a complete chronology of Thai law but the progressive formalization of property protection and criminal responsibility. Modern Thai criminal law defines offenses through statutory elements and applies state sanctions through the criminal justice system (Boonchalermvipas, 1988; Meangsaeng, 2017).

The core provision for theft is Section 334 of the Penal Code, which criminalizes dishonestly taking away property belonging to another person or property in which another person has a share. Section 59 supplies the general principle of intentional criminal responsibility (Thailand, 1956). The analysis therefore identifies four central features relevant to comparison with Vinaya: a protected property interest, an act of taking, a dishonest mental element, and state adjudication of criminal liability. Unlike the Second Pārājika rule, the basic theft offense in Section 334 does not depend on a minimum property-value threshold for the existence of the offense. Separate statutory provisions govern aggravating circumstances and related property offenses (Thiumchan & Viriyayutthangkul, 2022).

From an ethical perspective, Thai theft law protects security of possession and ownership and seeks to deter wrongful appropriation. Its consequences are public-law sanctions imposed by the state, such as imprisonment or fines, rather than a religious status determination. The findings for Objective 1 therefore establish the legal side of the comparison without importing Vinaya criteria into the definition of the state offense.

Objective 2: Development and Principles of the Second Pārājika Rule

The Second Pārājika rule developed within the Vinaya as part of the Buddha's regulation of monastic conduct. The Vinaya presents disciplinary rules as serving multiple purposes, including restraining misconduct, maintaining harmony in the Saṅgha, building confidence among the laity, and preserving the teaching (Horner, 2014). The origin narrative associated with the rule on taking what has not been given (adinnādāna) illustrates how specific conduct generated a disciplinary response and subsequent clarification of the rule (Oldenberg, 2005).

The documentary analysis identifies several conditions relevant to a Pārājika determination for theft: the property belongs to another; the monk recognizes another's ownership; there is an intention to steal; the property reaches the value threshold prescribed for a defeat offense; and the monk performs the act of taking to the degree required by the Vinaya analysis (Horner, 2014). The value threshold is especially important. Conduct involving property below the threshold may still be blameworthy or constitute a lesser Vinaya offense, but it does not automatically constitute Pārājika. This differs from the basic Thai theft offense, which does not make a minimum value threshold an element of liability.

Intention also requires careful distinction. Thai criminal law uses statutory concepts of intention and dishonesty, whereas the Vinaya inquiry asks whether the monk had the relevant intention to steal within the disciplinary framework. These concepts overlap in their concern with culpable mental states but are not legally interchangeable. The consequence also differs fundamentally: Pārājika entails irreversible loss of eligibility to remain a bhikkhu, whereas state punishment is imposed within the criminal justice system. Objective 2 therefore establishes the ethical and monastic foundations of the rule without prematurely comparing procedures or proposing integration.

Objective 3: Integrated Framework Linking Thai Theft Law and the Second Pārājika Rule

The comparative analysis found both convergence and divergence. The two systems converge in condemning wrongful appropriation, protecting legitimate property interests, and requiring a culpable mental element. They diverge in jurisdiction, legal source, property-value requirements, institutional decision-maker, procedure, and consequence. Thai law determines criminal liability applicable to citizens generally; Vinaya determines monastic disciplinary liability within the Saṅgha. The study therefore does not support the claim that

the two systems are identical or that there is no conflict at all. Rather, it identifies a need to distinguish substantive compatibility from procedural tension.

The most important substantive differences concern property value and intention. Under the Second Pārājika rule, the prescribed value threshold helps determine whether theft reaches the level of a defeat offense; under Section 334 of the Penal Code, no comparable minimum value threshold determines whether basic theft exists. Both systems consider culpable intention, but Thai criminal law defines criminal intention and dishonest taking through state law, while Vinaya evaluates intention within a religious disciplinary inquiry. A finding of criminal theft therefore does not by itself establish Pārājika, and a Vinaya determination does not substitute for a criminal judgment.

The principal procedural tension arises when state custody affects monastic status. Section 29 of the Sangha Act authorizes an investigation officer, under specified circumstances involving arrest, provisional release, and custody, to proceed with compulsory renunciation of monkhood. Section 30 applies when imprisonment, confinement, or detention is to occur pursuant to a court judgment or court order (National Office of Buddhism, 2021). These provisions regulate institutional status in connection with state custody; they do not constitute a Vinaya finding that the monk has committed Pārājika. This distinction supports a neutral procedural concern about how pre-adjudication or custody measures relate to the presumption of innocence and to the Saṅgha's disciplinary competence (Charoonchart, 2021; Wongwangphoem & Khwayotha, 2025).

The thematic synthesis of the expert interviews centered on three practical issues: the timing of measures affecting monastic status, the need for officials handling monk-related cases to understand basic Vinaya distinctions, and the need for clearer coordination between legal and ecclesiastical authorities. These themes informed, but did not conclusively determine, the study's policy proposals. The integrated framework therefore separates three functions: (1) state criminal adjudication under Thai law; (2) monastic disciplinary determination under Vinaya; and (3) institutional coordination under the Sangha Act and related procedures. Peaceful coexistence is promoted not by merging the two legal systems, but by clarifying their boundaries while encouraging non-greed (alobha), contentment (santuṭṭhi), fairness, due process, and mutual institutional respect.

Discussion

The first objective demonstrates that Thai theft law operates through a state-centered system of criminal liability in which Section 334 defines dishonest taking and Section 59 provides the general framework for intention. This finding is consistent with legal scholarship emphasizing the regulatory and protective functions of criminal law (Chekeevong, 2004; Kasemsap, 1996). Establishing this legal baseline is essential because it prevents the subsequent comparison with Buddhist discipline from obscuring the distinct purposes and procedures of state law.

The second objective shows that the Second Pārājika rule constitutes a separate monastic disciplinary regime embedded within the Vinaya. Its determination depends on factors such as ownership, knowledge, intention to steal, completion of the act, and the prescribed property-value threshold (Horner, 2014). This supports Buddhist-law scholarship that treats the Vinaya as a genuine normative system rather than merely a body of moral advice (Voyce, 2007). Accordingly, criminal liability for theft cannot automatically establish Pārājika, because the two systems apply different legal categories, decision-making processes, and consequences.

The findings under Objective 3 are best interpreted through legal pluralism. Thai monks are simultaneously subject to state law, ecclesiastical regulation, and monastic discipline, a condition identified in recent scholarship on contemporary Thai Buddhist governance (Borchert, 2022). Schonthal (2022) similarly demonstrates that Buddhist legal systems negotiate between normative unity and plurality, reinforcing the need to distinguish rather than collapse overlapping jurisdictions. The present study extends this perspective by separating three institutional determinations: criminal guilt, Vinaya liability, and administrative consequences affecting monastic status.

This distinction is particularly important in relation to Sections 29 and 30 of the Sangha Act. The issue is not that these provisions confer inherently "unjust" authority, but that, in certain circumstances, their operation can affect monastic status before final criminal adjudication (National Office of Buddhism, 2021; Charoonchart, 2021; Wongwangphoem & Khwayotha, 2025). Recent Thai scholarship has likewise called for closer examination of the relationship between state authority, monks' legal status, constitutional rights, and Vinaya principles (Patipanavat et al., 2023; Phramaha Anuwong Mermana, 2026).

The study therefore supports a model of coordinated jurisdiction, not institutional substitution. Criminal authorities retain responsibility for state offenses, while competent monastic authorities determine Vinaya consequences. Its principal contribution is to clarify that peaceful coexistence depends on procedural clarity, institutional competence, communication, and Vinaya literacy rather than on merging the two normative systems. Future research should test whether such coordination improves perceived fairness, institutional trust, and case management in actual monk-related legal proceedings.

New Knowledge from the Research

This study proposes an integrated framework for addressing cases in which alleged property offenses by Buddhist monks fall simultaneously within Thai criminal law, the Second Pārājika rule (Dutiyapārājika), and relevant provisions of the Sangha Act. The framework was developed from documentary analysis and expert interviews and is organized into four interrelated stages: input, process, output, and outcome. Its purpose is not to merge secular criminal law and Buddhist monastic discipline, but to clarify their respective functions and identify appropriate points of coordination.

The input stage comprises the principal normative sources relevant to such cases: the Second Pārājika rule in the Vinaya and its commentarial tradition, Thai criminal law concerning theft, and Sections 29 and 30 of the Sangha Act. These sources operate differently. Thai criminal law applies generally to persons within state jurisdiction, whereas the Vinaya governs monastic disciplinary status. The Sangha Act forms an institutional bridge where state custody and monastic status intersect. Careful analysis of these sources is therefore necessary before determining how an accused monk should be treated.

The process stage concerns procedural coordination. Two broad policy options emerge. The first is a formal review of Sections 29 and 30 to determine whether their operation adequately balances state custody requirements, procedural fairness, and monastic status. The second is to retain the existing statutory framework while strengthening consultation with competent ecclesiastical authorities, distinguishing criminal liability from Vinaya liability, and providing relevant officials with basic training in Buddhist disciplinary procedures. Any preliminary Vinaya inquiry should complement, rather than replace, the state criminal process.

The output stage consists of improved procedural clarity, more appropriate treatment of accused monks, and clearer institutional standards. These improvements may reduce confusion between criminal accusation, compulsory renunciation, and a formal Pārājika determination. They may also

strengthen confidence that monks and laypersons are treated fairly under state law while preserving the Saṅgha's disciplinary competence.

The final outcome stage is peaceful coexistence based on fairness, institutional clarity, mutual respect, and protection of property rights. The framework's principal contribution is a coordinated model in which Thai law and Vinaya remain distinct normative systems but operate in a complementary manner. Rather than assuming that legal harmony requires unifying the two systems, the framework shows that peaceful coexistence is better promoted by clearly separating their jurisdictions, procedures, and consequences while establishing appropriate mechanisms for communication and coordination.

Figure 1. Integrated Coordination Framework for Thai Law on Theft and the Second Pārājika Rule

Conclusion

This study analyzed Thai law on theft, the Second Pārājika rule, and their institutional intersection in cases involving Buddhist monks. Thai criminal law and Vinaya share a concern with wrongful taking and property protection, but they differ in source, jurisdiction, elements, procedure, and consequence. Thai theft law is a public criminal regime centered on dishonest taking and state adjudication; the Second Pārājika rule is a monastic disciplinary regime in which ownership, knowledge, intention, action, and the prescribed value threshold determine whether misconduct reaches the level of defeat. The study therefore rejects any simple equation between criminal theft and Pārājika. It proposes instead a three-function framework that separates criminal adjudication, Vinaya determination, and institutional coordination. The main procedural concern arises when state custody measures affect monastic status before final criminal

adjudication. In response, the article recommends clearer coordination, Vinaya literacy among relevant officials, and careful consideration of whether statutory or procedural reform is warranted. These proposals remain normative and require further legal and empirical evaluation. The study's principal contribution is to show that peaceful coexistence is better supported by institutional clarity, due process, and respect for both legal and monastic competence than by allowing either normative system to stand in for the other.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Legal and Procedural Management

Throughout the comprehensive and intensive study of the secular law on theft and discipline on the second Pārājika rule, as well as an observation of scandalous situations in Thailand, the solutions proposed to rectify the problematic issues and improve the situations which are associated with the Buddhist discipline dimension are generated according to these procedural methods indicated below: -

1. The Amendment of the Buddhist Saṅgha Act:

The Buddhist Saṅgha Act has placed excessive power on judicial officials, especially in sections 29 and 30. In this regard, it is likely to trigger strong criticism over compelled disrobing before a definite determination of guilt, even though it operates in conformity with the prescribed law of the Buddhist Saṅgha Act. Therefore, it would be an effective solution to reform certain parts of the Buddhist Saṅgha Act to avoid public outrage.

2. The Maintenance of the Aforementioned Buddhist Saṅgha Act:

If amending or rectifying the Buddhist Saṅgha Act seems impossible, its preservation can be pursued instead. Additionally, these approaches are introduced as follows:

(1) Allegations involving monks should first be investigated by the monastic authorities to circumvent unfair treatment imposed by judicial officials who lack Buddhist disciplinary education.

(2) If the alleged conduct does not rise to the level of Pārājika but instead constitutes a lesser transgression, particularly one subjected to social reproach yet not amounting to a criminal offense under the Thai Penal Code, then proceedings should be conducted in accordance with the disciplinary procedures established by the Buddha within the Vinaya framework.

(3) The legal personnel should be taught and trained in ecclesiastical procedural management in tune with the Buddhist disciplinary practice and to avoid the consequences of the unwanted outcome arising from outrageous and unreliable criticism.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study provides a foundation for further research on the relationship between Thai criminal law, Buddhist monastic discipline, and procedural justice. Future studies may extend the present findings through the following topics:

(1) A Comparative Study of Thai Legal Proceedings and Monastic Rule Process in Treating the Pastoral Offender.

(2) A Study of Justice in Thai Legal Process for Treating the Population with Various Status: Focused on Ecclesiastical One.

(3) A Comparative Study of Treating the Religious Members Found in Thai Legal Process.

(4) A Study of Restorative Justice from Thai Law and Buddhist Ethical Integration in Theravāda Buddhism.

(5) Developing a Harmonized Procedural Framework between Saṅgha Discipline and Thai Criminal Justice in Cases of Property Offenses

References

Bangkok Post. (2018, May 24). Senior monks arrested for embezzlement, robbery. https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1471861/senior-monks-arrested-for-embezzlement-robbery

Boonchalermvipas, S. (Trans.). (1988). *The theory of three-tiered law in the criminal aspect*. P. K. Printing House.

Borchert, T. (2022). Monks, the state, and monastic governance in contemporary Thailand. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion, 90*(3), 654–673. https://doi.org/10.1093/jaarel/lfac067

Charoonchart, C. (2021). Present guideline to Niggahakamma: Leaving monkhood. *Journal of Buddhist Innovation Review, 2*(3), 26–36.

Chekeevong, N. (2004). *An introduction to the law (1st ed.).* Aksornthai Publisher.

Hobbes, T. (1996). Leviathan (R. Tuck, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Horner, I. B. (Trans.). (2014). *The book of the discipline (Vol. 1).* Pali Text Society.

Kasemsap, P. (1996). *Philosophy of law* (3rd ed.). Textbook and Teaching Materials Project, Faculty of Law, Thammasat University.

Meangsaeng, A. (2017). *The Thai legal history (3rd ed.).* Winyuchon Publication House.

National Office of Buddhism. (2021). *Sangha Act, B.E. 2505 (1962), as amended by Sangha Act (No. 4), B.E. 2561 (2018)* [English translation]. https://www.onab.go.th/th/content/category/detail/id/486/iid/7855

Oldenberg, H. (2005). *The Vinaya-Piṭaka (Vol. 3)*. Pali Text Society.

Patipanavat, T., Sutthibodee, S., & Buasiri, A. (2023). The Reform of the Thai Sangha Act Under the Code of Monastic Discipline (Vinaya). *Ph.D. in Social Sciences Journal, 13*(2), 486–500.

Payutto, P. A. (2018). *Dictionary of Buddhism by word order (31st ed.).* Sahadhammik.

Phramaha Anuwong Mermana. (2026). Restrictions on the Rights and Freedoms of Monks in Thailand's Legal System. *Chulalongkorn University Law Journal, 44*(1), 114–152. https://doi.org/10.58837/lawchulajournal.v44i1.281729

Schonthal, B. (2022). The cunning of legal pluralism: Negotiating monism and pluralism in Buddhist law. *Legal Pluralism and Critical Social Analysis, 54*(1), 31–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2022.2040141

Thailand. (1956). *Penal Code, B.E. 2499, §§ 59, 334* (as amended).

Thiumchan, B., & Viriyayutthangkul, Y. (Trans.). (2022). *The Criminal Code: Translated Thai-English*. Soutpaisal Publisher.

Voyce, M. (2007). The Vinaya and the Dharmaśāstra: Monastic law and legal pluralism in ancient India. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law, 39*(56), 33–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2007.10756614

Wongwangphoem, N., & Khwayotha, B. (2025). Legal problems related to criminal proceedings against Buddhist monks under the Sangha Act B.E. 2505. *Journal of Mani Chettha Ram Wat Chommani, 8*(4). 161–172.